THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXIV MAY, 1937 No. 203

EDITORIAL

God save the King!

"Let thy wisdom be his guide, and let thine arm strengthen him; let truth and justice, holiness and righteousness, peace and charity abound in his days. Direct all his counsels and endeavours to thy glory and the welfare of his subjects, and let him always possess the hearts of his people."

After this, the People shall be desired, secretly in their Prayers, to make their humble supplications to God for all these things: for which Prayers there shall be silence kept for a space.

"For George, our King, that the God and Father of us all will grant him his heart's desire, and fulfil all his mind;

That at his Coronation the oil of sacring may be to him a sacrament of inward spiritual grace;

That the hand of the Lord will fasten him as a nail in a sure place, and that he may be as a throne of glory to his father's house;

For Elizabeth our Queen, that she, whose outward clothing is of wrought gold, may be all glorious within, a queen of wisdom and gentleness and charity;

For the Queen Mother, that she may have beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness;

For the Princess Elizabeth, that the life of the child and the life of the Princess may be defended from all evil and be in favour with God and man;

For the people of this Nation and Empire, that they too may be crowned with the glory of well doing;

That our rejoicing may be clean of pride, and our national loyalty rooted in continual obedience to the King of kings;

That King George may reign over us for many years, and that the years of his reign may be years of glory to God, of peace and goodwill among men."

In his recently translated *Life of Jesus* (Hodder and Stoughton, 7s. 6d.), M. François Mauriac, the distinguished French novelist, has some interesting suggestions in regard to the veracity of the Gospel narratives. On the whole he seems what many of us would call uncritical, as those who turn to the study of the New Testament from other fields of learning often are. He does not indeed argue, as a lawyer once did, that St. Matthew has enjoyed the usufruct of the authorship of the first Gospel, and that no counter-claim having ever been established in a sufficient court, St. Matthew may fairly be presumed to be the author. Nor is it that he is ignorant of what scholars have said. There was a time when, under the influence of M. Loisy, he "abstained for years from reading the Fourth Gospel, and even among the Synoptics he rarely strayed beyond the text of Mark." His present attitude is deliberate: "The New Testament as it is presented to us today is the story of a man with definite traits, of whom each one of us can attempt the psychological portrait." His book is thus an impression based on the whole of the available evidence, and though he does not say this in so many words, he would probably reply, if challenged on his use of St. John, that it is at least highly significant that such a portrait has been painted; the portraiture cannot be without reason; whether or not it is a true portrait, it is a just picture.

Among some of those who have preceded him he finds two opposite defects. There are some who deny the supernatural and "do not see the God in Jesus." Such critics have closed their eyes to the real facts, and it is impossible that they should arrive at the true conclusion. Others, with pious motives, have set their Lord in an unreal and impossible world, where He "presents none of the features of a real person." It is amid these contradictions that he is bold enough to suggest that a Catholic novelist has perhaps the right to bring his testimony, writing with all humility—"a life of Jesus should be written on one's knees, with a feeling of unworthiness great enough to make the pen drop from his hand"; he yet claims to know by virtue of his experience the difference between a real person and an artificial and composite being. We must think, he says, of our Lord as "a man among many, one of them—so much, indeed, that to distinguish him from the eleven poor people about him, the kiss of Judas must point him out." And yet "this journeyman carpenter speaks and acts as God." Now, von Hügel would not have said that. An English Catholic, one to whom it would seem dishonest

to be in any respect uncritical, above all at the very point where everything is at stake, would perhaps have said "as one whom we can now see to have been God." The fact is that there is a Johannine quality about M. Mauriac's book. Here and there it is definitely unhistorical, as when it is said that Martha and Mary and Lazarus "knew that he was God and loved him in his humanity," or of the disciples in the Upper Room that "now they knew that their friend was God and that God was love." For ourselves, we have no thought of denying these affirmations, but we should put them in the commentary rather than in the text. It may well be that those who were brought up on the Markan tradition use it as a Procrustean bed, and forget its essential limitations when they make it the measure of all things. It is true indeed that the Markan tradition had begun with the fresh study of recent years to glow with a glory which was not perceived a generation ago. We know now that Mark is a theologian and an evangelist, even as John is. Perhaps the reason why we are so well content with Mark and John is that we have them both. The Church is "fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth." John knows that there have been other gospels. As Clement of Alexandria says: "St. John, last, when he saw that the outward facts had been set forth in the Gospels, impelled by his friends, divinely moved by the Spirit, made a spiritual Gospel." We do not want to "take away from the words of the book of this prophecy." No threat is needed to dissuade us from wanting to do that, and it is certain that we could not add to it. But we read it side by side with Mark. Mark tells us how it all began. John tells us how it all ended. And a modern *Life of Jesus* lacks the authority to be simply Johannine, without a word of explanation.

Yet it is a beautiful book. The paraphrasing of the Gospel narrative—a test by which so many preachers fail—is done with a strong and frugal touch. And in one or two crucial instances, the woman who was a sinner, and the woman taken in adultery, where it would have been easy to go wrong, M. Mauriac is superb. Some of the modern biographical books about Biblical characters, when they find in the story a hint of sex, enlarge on it with what is intended to be psychology, but is in fact neither religious nor scientific. M. Mauriac's treatment of the *pericope* (John vii. 53-viii. 11) is exquisite in insight and restraint. Or could faith and realism be better joined than in this passage:

> "What did they say of him? Why did the son of the carpenter not take a wife? Perhaps it was his piety which forbade. Uninterrupted prayer, although not manifested by words, creates about the holy an atmosphere of peaceful contemplation and adoration. We have all known beings who, busied with ordinary tasks, remain constantly in the presence of God; and the vilest men respected them, sensing this presence in an obscure way.
>
> "In truth he who would one day cause the wind and the sea to obey him, had also the power to cause a great peace to reign over hearts. He had the power to prevent women from being troubled at sight of him; he could appease the rising tempest because it was not the Son of God who would have been adored in him, but a child among the sons of men."

The book is an impression. It reminds us of Matthew Arnold. Arnold believed that by his critical faculty—and it will be remembered that to criticism he gave a large meaning—he could discern the essential Jesus. Thus in *Literature and Dogma* he wrote of "the Kingdom of God is within you," that "such an account of the Kingdom of God has more right, even if recorded only once, to pass with us for Jesus Christ's own account than the common materializing accounts, if repeated twenty times." This is the sort of thing that M. Mauriac does, though less consciously, with less elaboration, more simply and with more devotion. Matthew Arnold could never quite kneel. He could only lean reverently forward. There is also, of course, the difference that Arnold was a nineteenth-century Protestant and Mauriac is a twentieth-century Catholic. We welcome his picture, we are sure that he is much nearer the truth than Arnold, and yet we feel that the last word has not been said. Somehow, difficult as it is, the history must be critically discovered and then used constructively for the purposes of faith. For help with the historical process many of us are grateful to *The Riddle of the New Testament.* Nevertheless we find it at times over-subtle, over-apt to see Messianism and prophecy-fulfilling everywhere. Let it be supplemented by Professor Dodd's *The Apostolic Preaching*, a book as learned, but less technical and more restrained. His thesis, broadly, is that with the coming of Jesus into the world the *eschaton* has entered human life, and men are now living "in the Kingdom," with the powers of the world to come. This treatment satisfies. There are values for which history asks, and values for which faith asks. Led by the Cambridge Professor, we seem to approach both.

The Bishop of Southwark's little volume, *The Sacrament of Sacrifice* (Longmans, 2s.), is full of meat. It is the work of a thoroughly competent theologian, who brings to his pastoral vocation a knowledge of both history and principle. The book is not very easy reading, not because it is anywhere obscure, but because it keeps the reader thinking all the time. We have become so accustomed to books which contain a great deal of padding that the wholesome effort to maintain continuous attention is not so easy as it should be. But this is a merit of the book, and a fault only of the public. What the Bishop says is admirable. He touches highly controversial questions, but there is a complete absence of the controversial spirit. Devout purpose and theological learning are applied, calmly and reasonably, to the elucidation of problems which through ignorance and prejudice and sentiment have come to seem complicated and formidable. The meaning of Sacrifice and the true purpose of the Holy Eucharist, which is to provide what St. Paul calls " access with confidence " to God *per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum*, are made perfectly clear.

At the end of the book the Bishop suggests an alternative form of Consecration. He has no theological objection to the form of 1927, except that it is too long. He avoids the sense of abruptness which is felt when the 1661 Prayer of Consecration is followed immediately by the 1661 Prayer of Oblation without any link except a " Wherefore," by inserting an *Anamnesis*. So far all would approve. Further, he is anxious to meet the reproach that there has been in the Anglican Order since 1549 no reference to the work of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly he maintains the theological principle that such reference should come, as Pentecost itself did, after the Words of Institution, and at the same time avoids the appearance of committing the Church of England to an " Eastern " theory of Consecration, in this way:

> . . . And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice, humbly beseeching thee that all we who are partakers of this Holy Communion may in the power of thy life-giving Spirit be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. . . .

This is good, but it misses being an actual *Epiklesis*. There is surely a great deal to be said for 1549, with the addition perhaps of " us and " before " these thy gifts "; for having this before the Words of Institution; and then, as well in order to do justice to the New Testament order of events as on general

grounds, for the Bishop's proposed reference (it is hardly more) to the work of the Holy Spirit at the point where he suggests it.

A disaster has occurred. A suitcase, travelling with the editor to London, and containing a number of manuscripts which were under consideration, was stolen. The annoyance thus caused to various writers is deeply regretted, and their patience, which has from time to time been tested in other ways, is such that it is probably no consolation to them that their inconvenience is slight compared to that of the owner of the bag. The difference is expressed in 2 Corinthians iv. 8 and 9. It is the difference between being smitten down and being destroyed. The only consolation that any of the sufferers can have is in contemplating the dismay of the dishonest person who finds that the greater part of his haul consists of letters and papers of a theological nature. There is an old epigram which runs:

"I've lost my portmanteau!" "I pity your grief!"
"My sermons were in it." "I pity the thief!"

which was once rendered into Greek (we believe in *Sabrinæ Corolla*) as

ὤλεσα τὸν σάκκον. φεῦ, φεῦ, κακόδαιμον ὅδιτα.
ἐν δὲ λόγους πολλούς. φεῦ σέθεν, οἰκτρὲ κλοπεύ.

ANGLICAN WORSHIP*

THE purpose of this little paper is rightly described in the Conference programme as introductory, and is to try to indicate, especially to those who are attending one of our conferences for the first time, a kind of attitude they are likely to find in discussion, especially with regard to the Holy Eucharist. I say "likely" because the discussion will naturally be what you make it, and there are no attempts at restraint on the part of those responsible for the conference. But it is not the first of these conferences which has been held. It is the tenth, at the first two of which, and at most of the succeeding ones, or at some part thereof, I have had the privilege of being present. In the course of these conferences we have discovered a temper and developed a kind of tradition which has at all events made their continuance both possible and happy, not to mention other, and as we believe, more solid achievements. I do not claim to speak on behalf of the Student Christian Movement which has organized these meetings, nor for our Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius which has sprung from them, but only for myself, and to put before you an Anglican attitude towards the Holy Eucharist which has found itself quite at home in these conferences and which has doubtless been to no small extent developed by them, and which, in the opinions which it reflects is, I trust, in no way contrary to the mind of the Church.

I

It is well known that the Anglican Church is steadily restoring the Holy Eucharist to the central place in her worship. It was never intended otherwise by the majority of the Reformers who compiled our Prayer Book, but the continental reformed interest proved too strong, and Cranmer's attempt to "turn the Mass into a Communion" came to mean the abolition, save on infrequent occasions, of both. The effect of teaching upon practice is much greater than many persons cynically suppose, and as one great traditional characteristic of the Eucharist after another was denied by certain reformers, so the service seems to have been regarded as less and less important. The second exhortation in 1552 all but forbade

* A paper given at the tenth Anglo-Russian Student Conference organized by the Student Christian Movement, Thursday, April 16, 1936.

non-communicating attendance, and the rubric ordering those intending to communicate to signify their names to the curate, which has of more recent years been found effective by some clergy in discouraging persons from communicating at late celebrations, probably had the effect of discouraging people from communicating at all until it came to be generally disregarded. The Caroline divines were unable to restore the Liturgy, and the Evangelical Revival, though in the case of the Wesleys productive of Eucharistic piety and some beautiful hymns, subordinated all services to the pulpit.

The restoration of liturgical worship soon became one of the great aims of the Oxford Movement, and has been one of its most notable results. The following sentences are from an independent observer, Professor Brilioth: "The revival which began with the Oxford Movement has been above all a revival of sacramental religion." "The re-birth of Eucharistic piety is the most active of all the forms of fermentation which the Oxford Movement set working in the spiritual life of England. Throughout the whole of the Church of England the place of the Eucharist has undergone a profound change even in the Low Church section. In most places the celebration of the Holy Eucharist once a week, besides the appointed holy days, is regarded as the minimum standard, to fall below which would be regarded as a mark of slackness. A hundred years ago such a standard was a rarely-attained maximum. Step by step the Eucharist is making its way to the central place in the worship of the Church even where the chief service is Matins as it still is in the majority of churches." This is now being encouraged and urged, even by episcopal authority. My own diocesan, the Bishop of Southwark, who is in no way regarded as a party leader, said in his charge to his clergy this year: "I would put before you as emphatically as I can my strong personal conviction which I believe is supported by the best scholarship, theological, historical, and liturgical, and the devotion of all parts of the Church, that the Eucharist ought to be the central service of the Church and the focus of its whole life. The sacred feast is itself the consummation of the Sacrifice Manwards as the Heavenly Session is its consummation Godwards. It is offered by God for Man and to Man. It is offered by men for men to God. It is the essential and unchanging activity of His one and indivisible Person. He offers Himself in perfect love as God to Man and as Man to God. The celebration ought to be the act of the congregation, its principal corporate act of worship, accompanied with music, and dignified with as much ceremonial as the custom of the church in question employs for its principal service."

This conviction has undoubtedly been shared by the vast majority of those who have attended our conferences. It is taken for granted by those who arrange them, and our common participation in Eucharistic worship day by day has been our greatest bond of fellowship. It is well known how this liturgical revival has extended beyond the confines of the Anglican Church and made itself felt in Nonconformist circles. It does seem to me that if all bodies of Christians would only restore this service to the central position in their corporate worship, though they retain for the time being the theological assumptions which they associate with it, it would be a tremendous step forward in the direction of the unity for which we all long. It is in the constant offering of Eucharistic worship that we realize what we and our particular liturgies lack. It is when we join in each other's Eucharistic worship that we gradually come to realize what they have to offer.

II

When we come to ask in what form and manner the Holy Eucharist has been restored in our churches, the story is not altogether a happy one. The Tractarians had a wealth of patristic learning, and the Oxford Movement developed patristic studies on an unprecedented scale. But the Eucharistic revival was more the work of the second generation than the first. At this period the Movement was considerably discredited in the Universities after the secessions, but found itself in the slums of our great cities, and it was in these parishes that the Movement developed. A slum priest, or for that matter a priest in an ordinary working-class parish, has little time for reading (as this paper testifies) and usually no very great knowledge of or interest in the doings of the primitive church. At that period much less was known of mediæval life than is known today, while nothing at all was known of Orthodoxy. All that remained was contemporary Roman practice. So it was that the modern Roman custom of the sung Mass without communicants and all the communions at said Masses was generally adopted. There was, of course, also the entirely laudable tradition that one's communion should be one's first food and first act of the day, and yet the people seemed to want to worship at eleven o'clock.

Now the interaction of dogma, rite, and ceremony, using those last two words in their strict sense, is extremely interesting and important, and not always easy accurately to trace.

At the Reformation dogma moulded rites, and controlled ceremonies, usually by abolishing them. It even wielded an

influence beyond, in the creation of an atmosphere, so that, putting it quite crudely, what is admittedly a Catholic liturgy in the Book of Common Prayer could be, and was, interpreted in an almost wholly Protestant sense. But influences wane, and atmospheres change, while liturgies remain. It was found that the Prayer Book liturgy is patient of, encourages, and even demands a Catholic interpretation, and this is becoming more and more widely accepted. But here it is that practice has determined emphasis, if not actual interpretation. The separation of communion from worship and the pleading of the Holy Sacrifice has had several undesirable results. First, it has largely resulted in the absence of what Brilioth calls the " Communion-Fellowship " element in our churches. I know of devout souls who almost think it wrong to receive communion at a sung Mass, and much prefer, as they would say, to do it quietly. I have been at churches where so devout are the communicants that they will not speak to each other either before or after service, but in silence hurry home to have their breakfasts. I have also found quite well-instructed individuals who have thought that you cannot have a High Mass with communicants. For such souls the sacrificial idea at a Low Mass is probably only preserved by their sometimes being present without communicating, while it is obvious that their communions have become matters of entirely individual piety with no social significance nor Pauline sense of their relationship with one another because of their incorporation into the Body of Christ whatever. Secondly, the instructed but none too zealous soul will hear Mass at a late celebration but seldom communicate. This is a complaint one frequently hears from churches where the eleven o'clock Mass has been established for years. I do not, however, think that infrequency in communion is as bad at churches where there is an extra-liturgical cultus of the Blessed Sacrament, which does seem to lead to personal love and devotion to our Blessed Lord. It is, I believe, quite a mistake to think that Adoration is made a substitute for communion. Thirdly, some less instructed persons are the more able to regard the Sung Eucharist as just a nice kind of service and a much nicer kind than Sung Matins. It may be argued that the Mass is not for the uninstructed, which is true; nevertheless, the liturgical worship of the Church, both Eastern and Western, does make a searching appeal even to those who do not understand very much about it. It has tremendous symbolic effect, and time and again is found most effective both in teaching and towards conversion. It was instituted, as our Catechism says, " for the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ *and* of the benefits which we

receive thereby." The effect of the sung Mass without communicants upon persons becoming interested in the Catholic religion can only be partial, and such indeed it must be even upon the instructed Christian who habitually assists at it.

In churches of the present-day more central Anglican type, where, although there are frequent early celebrations, and evening communion is abhorred, the chief service of the day is Sung Matins, Holy Communion is more than ever a matter of personal piety, and in such circles the horrid notion seems to prevail that there are ordinary church members and a special kind known as communicants. The Blessed Sacrament is indeed regarded as spiritual food, and the reception of It as conferring grace, but the memorial, sacrificial, and fellowship aspects are almost wholly absent. At such churches, and indeed at many of the more traditionally Catholic type, it is the custom for guilds and societies to make an act of worship known as a " corporate communion," a redundant phrase if ever there was one, and one which well illustrates Baron von Hügel's strong dislike of little societies within the Body of Christ.

In our truly called more Evangelical churches, where evening communion is practised and everyone is encouraged to stay, the fellowship is more noticeable (though based on more subjective grounds), the memorial aspect is prominent, but the sacrificial entirely absent.

This restriction of doctrine by practice is, I am sure, still more acute in the matter of ceremonial. At the time of the revival, and still, for that matter, an Anglican priest is in something of a dilemma. As a brother priest said to me the other day, there are three and only three ways of doing things in the Anglican Church with regard to ceremonial. There is what is believed to be one of the mediæval uses known as the Sarum use, there is the modern Roman use, and W.V.L. On enquiry as to the meaning of W.V.L., I was informed that it stands for " What Vicar Likes !" But broadly speaking it is true. The choice is between a mediæval use, which is difficult to discover and more difficult to perform, modern Roman ceremonial, and individualism. In the opinion of many there is more to be said for something that is living than something that is archaic if æsthetic, and I am glad to say there is among the ranks of the clergy a strong and healthy dislike of individualism. It is this which, in the absence of ceremonial direction in our own Church, leads many clergy to adopt modern Roman custom. It is definite, precise, and there is a good translation of what you have to do. No priest can rightly be accused of being disloyal merely because he uses or tries to use Roman ceremonial in conjunction with the Anglican rite. But a price

has to be paid. This ceremonial, which of course is based on a non-vernacular rite, is intended to express certain doctrinal assumptions which represent what has come to be the peculiar Latin interpretation of the Eucharist, and these in their turn are based upon one particular interpretation of the Atonement. We often acclaim ceremonial because of its teaching value. But it is bound to teach the view which has produced it and which it is meant to express. So long as some of our clergy are limited to Roman ceremonial they will be limited to the Roman view of the Eucharist and Atonement. Furthermore, the ceremony tends to modify the rite, and such churches as have completely Roman ceremonial find difficulty in retaining anything like the Prayer Book rite. I am not suggesting that the current Roman interpretation of the Mass is wrong, or that the Prayer Book rite is adequate. What I do suggest is that the Roman interpretation represents an over-emphasis of some aspects, and an under-emphasis of others, that this is expressed in Roman ceremonial and practice, and that their use constitutes a limitation.

Some liberal Anglo-Catholics use Roman ceremonial entirely, while their ideas are by no means circumscribed by Roman interpretation. Their position with regard to the Mass is, in a very much smaller and less important way, similar to that of the pre-war Roman Catholic modernists with regard to the Faith. The good that they would, they do not, but the evil which they would not, that they do! They are in danger, roughly speaking, of believing one thing and doing another, and they will certainly have their flocks believing differently from themselves. This leads directly to that divorce between educated belief and popular practice which most Anglicans hasten to deplore wherever they find it. Ceremonial must express and teach the belief of those who use it. It must be admitted that this attitude does not very much help the parish priest in his difficulty of deciding what to tell the servers to do, and what to do himself. The present period in which much ceremonial performance is bizarre and absurd will probably be prolonged. But ceremonial to be real must be both natural and reasonable. Much of that which is attempted in our churches is neither. It is like a growing boy trying to wear the clothes either of someone who is under developed or else deformed. I trust that this reference to ceremonial will not seem trivial in a conference which is about to listen to theological profundities, but I think that it is really important and that it may help our Russian (and Nonconformist) friends to understand something of what they are likely to see and hear in our churches.

It is probable that liturgical forms, like ceremonial, must

be of something approaching spontaneous growth, or at all events free acceptance which will probably imply modification, before they can be stereotyped, and even then there must be the possibility of dropping what is not required, otherwise a liturgy will become like a church which has never refused a gift and never destroyed one. But would-be reformers and restorers would do well to ponder that their efforts, even when applauded at the time, are by no means always appreciated by succeeding generations. Spiritual directors are constantly warned that all souls cannot be forced into the same mould, so it would seem that all nations cannot be expected to conform to one liturgical tradition. There must be some flexibility, but there must also be continuity. It is only then that liturgical worship can be the real worship of the people. Speaking of the German Lutheran Spitta, who was anxious for liturgical reform, and constructed a service after a pattern of his own, Professor Brilioth says: "The author of this scheme was serenely convinced that it was possible for him, sitting at his desk, to create out of his own personal interpretation of the primitive rite a better order of service than that which has grown up in the Church through the centuries. This attitude of mind is common to many of the modern German proposals for liturgical reform; but it is deeply in conflict with the nature of liturgy itself. For liturgy indeed is patient of pruning and revision, and it is willing to allow expression to new ideas which well forth out of the depths of religious consciousness; but it always firmly refuses to become the slave of a theological fashion of the day." For this reason it seems to me doubtful if the proposed alternative canon of the 1928 Prayer Book would ever have been widely accepted. The one thing which might have recommended it was that it was optional. It could not consequently be said that it was forced upon the people. Yet to me there is something strangely incongruous about an optional liturgy. It fails to reflect the givenness of the Eucharist, and the inner compulsion of the Church in offering it. It is true that it was accepted as an alternative by a majority of both clergy and laity in Church Assembly, but that is not the Church, which is the people of God before the altar of God. It was the big break with tradition, a tradition largely crystallized by a fixed ceremonial, and carrying with it a particular theory of consecration, which made the new canon unpopular. I well remember a fellow-student, on hearing the new canon explained, ask the lecturer, "But when does the priest elevate?" which illustrates how largely what is done and what has been done regulates what is believed by the average Anglican.

On the other hand, it is interesting to notice how much the Prayer-Book service has been modified, and how much is now taken for granted and approved by the people, who after all can read, and indeed love to follow in a book. To mention only a few things, and those all more or less of a non-controversial character and now generally allowed by authority, the substitution of the Kyrie for the Commandments, the omission of the collect for the King, the salutation, ascription of praise before and after the Gospel, the limitation of the preface to the celebrant, the saying or singing of the Benedictus and Agnus Dei; and, in the matter of ceremonial, genuflection, vestments, lights, processions, and the blessing and distribution of palms.

While worship can only be learned by experience and understood by practice, and liturgy be formed by spontaneity rather than by ingenuity, theology will none the less have its part to play. Some dogmatic theology is necessary for all prayer: "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that seek after Him." To have even the remotest idea of the Christian scheme of salvation one must believe that Jesus Christ is "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven," a fact which I myself did not know till I was thirteen or fourteen, believing God the Son to have begun to exist at Bethlehem, and God the Holy Ghost to have come after that. I may say that I was brought up as a Nonconformist. I do not say that unkindly, but I do suggest that the lack of dogmatic teaching is a great defect in some Nonconformist systems. Theology will probably have to play a restraining and negative and hence unpopular part in the formation of liturgy and the control of worship. It will have to prevent man from merely devising and indulging methods of worship which he finds easy and likes, from holding unworthy ideas about God, and indeed from creating God in his own image. Archdeacon Lilley considers that especially in the realm of Eucharistic piety this is just what theology has failed to do, but has rather followed devotion and endeavoured to rationalize it rather than to guide it.

Professor Brilioth says no church has a right to give up what her own history has taught her. We would ask our Russian friends not to forget that the piece of the rock whence we were hewn was the Western Church. We cannot deny our heritage or our temperament. By temperament and inclination we are pragmatic, and if we have not the Latin logic we have at all events some of the Latin genius for legislation which may at times suggest legalism. Something very like the Roman Mass was all our nation knew for nearly a thousand years, and our

present liturgy for directness and unadornment is, as befits our geographical position, far more "Western" than that of Rome. Our history, especially during the last hundred years, accounts for a largely Roman attitude towards the Eucharist, and there is much that Roman Eucharistic usage and piety has preserved, and as I think developed, which is valuable, and which we cannot and do not want to forget.

III

It will appear then, and here I think I speak for many besides myself, that we are endeavouring to restore the Eucharist to the people as the chief and most characteristic act of the Church's worship. But in doing so we have no wish necessarily to restore the Eucharist as it was either in theory or practice in the Middle Ages, nor as it is in the post-Reformation Roman Church, nor do we wish to imitate the Orthodox just because they are Catholic but not Roman. We do not want something primitive because it is ancient, nor modern because it is new, and least of all do we want something insular because it is national. We want the Eucharist in such a manner and celebrated in such a way as shall help us most fully to appreciate the different aspects which we believe our Lord would have us know, and some of which, in isolation, would appear to be at present best understood by the different parts of divided Christendom.

We shall only find this by experience. If any of you (as probably some of my brother clergy do) have tried to teach children Eucharistic worship, you will know that by far the best, if not the only way to do it, is practically, at a children's Mass or a Mass where you explain to them what is happening, and direct their prayers. It is no good giving them a series of little talks on Sunday afternoons in the Parish Hall. So we shall never learn the deepest mysteries of the liturgy nor the correctives for a possible false emphasis in Eucharistic faith from theological treatises but only by worship. The study of liturgiology can be a great help, but like the study of psychology it is only descriptive and cannot explain. It is partial, and easily becomes an abstraction. Liturgiology is to worship as commentaries are to the Bible, that is to say, no substitute for it. "The significant feature of every religion is its worship," writes Archdeacon Lilley, "and worship is significant because it reflects unerringly as in a mirror all the other features of a given religion, its doctrine, its discipline, and above all those distinctive but not easily definable characteristics which are inclusively called its ethos." This is because worship is an

activity of the whole man. It is so intimate and complex a matter of the soul or self that it cannot be comprehended by the mind alone. It cannot be adequately analyzed or described, nor can it be theoretically regulated.

One of the things in my own communion which members of the Catholic school have found most trying, and at times unfair, is repeated criticism, censure, and sometimes prohibition by authority, from persons who have never even tried to share our worship, to practise our pastoral method, or even to make the Eucharist central in their own worship. Only a few days ago I had the honour of a short conversation with a diocesan bishop on the matter of extra-liturgical devotions. He informed me that he was being pressed to allow them, but was not inclined to do so as he was opposed to them. I plucked up courage and asked his lordship if he had ever been present at Devotions in an Anglican church, even in his pre-episcopal days, and he replied that he had not. I would not say that his lordship is wrong, but the attitude is typical and significant.

An endeavour to understand by worship has from the first been one of the leading features of our conferences. It was not when we started designedly so. We had learned papers from theologians such as Bishop Frere and Bishop Gore on the dogmatic basis of the Church and Eucharist, and these were undoubtedly necessary. There is much loose talk these days as if worship had no dogmatic basis, which is absurd. But it was in our worship that these theses were understood and seen to be relevant and practical. Fr. Hebert, who has considerable experience of work for reunion, has drawn attention to what might almost be termed our technique in his book, *Liturgy and Society*, and approves of it. Perhaps it is an attempt to appreciate the spiritual riches of each other's inheritance by sharing in worship. We seek to be emancipated from all that limits and restricts and to know only the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.

FRANK BISHOP.

THE LAW OF DIVORCE AND THE PROBLEM FOR THE CHURCH

UNTIL the middle of the nineteenth century the English nation accepted the Marriage Laws of the English Church. It could be said in Halsbury's Laws of England that "the only kind of marriage which the English Law recognizes is one which is essentially a voluntary union for life of one man with one

woman to the exclusion of all others." A new situation, however, was created by the passing of the Marriage Act of 1857. Up to that time the law of the State allowed Separation, but not Divorce. The contradiction which the State has created, by approving Divorce and remarriage between those whose former partner in marriage still lives, has produced a serious problem for the Church.

During the last three years the Convocations, or Sacred Synods of the English Church, have been deliberating on the question whether persons who, "under the present English Law as to Divorce and remarriage, have contracted a legal marriage during the lifetime of a former partner of one of them," should be admitted to Holy Communion. The discussion has been prolonged. Nothing is finally determined as yet. But most Churchmen will agree that the decision, whatever it is, will be critical.

Legislation on Marriage in the Modern State is based on the principle that Marriage is a contract between two parties, which although intended to be permanent, can, like partnership in business, be entirely dissolved. By a decree of Divorce the Marriage ceases to exist. The persons therefore who, in accordance with the Civil Law, have been divorced are as free to enter upon the married state as if they had never been married at all. To what cases the dissolution of marriage can be extended and how often divorce and remarriage can be repeated is said to depend upon the State, which has inherent and final authority to decide. Divorce might conceivably be granted in cases of desertion, habitual drunkenness, imprisonment for life, mental malady, cruelty, and mutual incompatibility. It may certainly be found that, in a mixed population, consisting of various religions and of none, this standard of marriage relations is as high as the will of the majority can attain.

The marriage principles of the English Church are widely different. The Canon Law of 1604, which represents the inherited tradition of centuries, allows Separation, but expressly forbids Divorce. It rules distinctly that in cases where Separation has been allowed, "neither shall they during each other's life contract matrimony with any other person." The Church warns those who come to be married at its altars that "so many as are coupled together otherwise than God's Word doth allow are not joined together by God, neither is their Matrimony lawful." The Church does more. It requires those who desire its blessing on their marriage to take a solemn vow before God and the Church that their union is "for better or worse," and "until death do part them," and it impresses

all this obligation by the authority of our Lord's own words: "Those whom God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

The terms in which this doctrine of the Church of England has been represented to Convocation by its own selected Committee are that "The Church has a law to declare and a discipline to exercise for its members. Under that law the marriage of a husband and wife is 'till death us do part'; it is a lifelong vocation or relation, which not only ought not to be dissolved, but also involves a moral and spiritual bond which cannot be finally terminated save by death."*

Cases in which leaders of the Church in the past are said to have acted contrary to the Church's Canon Law are irrelevant. They only raise the question: By what authority were these contradictions to the law of the Church introduced? For the law of the English Church remains unchanged to this day. And it is by the law that the actions of individuals must be tested. Individual opinions cannot overrule the law of the Church. Sir Lewis Dibdin's† conclusion from the evidence of history has never been refuted, that the law of the Church of England as to the indissolubility of marriage remained unchanged from before the Reformation until after the present Canons of 1604 came into operation.

Between the marriage principles of the Nation and those of the Church there is an irreconcilable contradiction. The one affirms that Christian marriage can be dissolved, the other affirms that it cannot. The one allows Divorce, the other forbids it. A person who has been divorced and remarried has acted in accordance with the principles of the Nation, and in so doing has acted in opposition to the principles of the English Church.

As a writer in the *Spectator* has put it: "Marriage is for the State a civil contract, for the Church it is a Sacrament, and the Church, as a spiritual society differing in essentials from any ordinary human association, has standards to maintain completely independent of provisions which the State may formulate for the ordering of relations between its citizens."‡

The recent discussion on this subject has been seriously confused by the existence of two widely different conceptions of the essential nature of Christian Marriage. There is first what may be fairly called the ancient conception, that such marriage is not a mere contract between a man and a woman, but a contract in which God intervenes and blesses; a contract

* *Report*, p. 18.
† Dibdin and Healey, *English Church Law and Divorce*, p. 78.
‡ *Spectator*, Jan. 29, 1937, p. 157.

whose essential nature is that it is indissoluble, and cannot be terminated by human power, or by any cause except by death.

There is a second conception of Christian Marriage which by comparison may fairly be called modern, and which acknowledges concerning Divorce that there ought to be no such thing, that it is invariably a product of evil, that it never exists without inflicting grievous and deplorable injury. Nevertheless it maintains that Christian Marriage can in certain cases be dissolved. Indissolubility is represented as the Divine ideal. It is that towards which mankind should aspire. But while acknowledging that lifelong permanence is a consummation devoutly to be desired, it leaves room for modifications and exceptions. It declares that within the Church itself such a standard as absolute indissolubility may be at present beyond our capacity to attain.

It is, of course, obvious enough that those who hold the ancient conception, that it is inherent in the very nature of Christian Marriage that it cannot be dissolved, must, if they are consistent with their own accepted principles, reach widely different practical conclusions with regard to the admission of the divorced and remarried to Holy Communion, from the conclusions reached just as consistently by those who hold that marriage can be dissolved.

Of course, if our Lord only gave us an ideal towards which we should advance, but which the Church can adapt to the various requirements of successive centuries, then we are simply in the sphere of ecclesiastical regulations. If, however, it is inherent in the very essence of Christian Marriage that it cannot be dissolved, we are confronted with a Divine Constitution for His Church and then we are in a sphere where no human authority can dispense.

What is haunting a number of Churchmen is that this conception of Christ as the Revealer of an ideal rather than the Giver of an abiding law is, after all, a very recent speculation, which has by no means yet established itself among the Christian certainties, and is therefore an insecure, precarious basis on which to build.

Whence did the doctrine arise that Christian Marriage cannot be dissolved? Beyond question it arose from the teaching of our Lord. It was certainly not in the world before He came. But our Lord dismissed the bills of divorcement as a concession in the past to the hardness of men's hearts, and contrary to the standard of marriage divinely ordained. He taught the permanence of the married state. His Teaching seemed, even to His own disciples, so startling, so uncompromising, so stern, that they complained that "if the case of

the man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry." They could not fail to see that the demand was most exacting. But our Lord did not withdraw it. And it is a most impressive fact that this conception of the indissolubility of Christian Marriage prevailed in the primitive centuries in an atmosphere most uncongenial to laws so exacting and severe.

The Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation in its first Resolution " affirms as our Lord's principle and standard of marriage a lifelong and indissoluble union for better or for worse of one man with one woman, to the exclusion of all others on either side."

Here the marriage of Christians is declared according to our Lord's principle to be " indissoluble." Unless the terms are deliberately ambiguous, the Resolution cannot mean that Christian Marriage cannot be dissolved except by death, and also that it can. If Christian Marriage cannot be dissolved, then to dissolve it is to violate the principles and standard of Christ.

I

One reason urged in behalf of authorizing such persons to receive the Eucharist is that, with the exception of the Roman Catholic Church, the majority of Christian Communions are prepared to make concessions in difficult cases.

With the exception of the Roman Catholic Church! It is a rather considerable exception. And it is advisable to have before us the exact wording of the Roman Canon Law as revised in 1917. " A valid Marriage ratified and consummated can be dissolved by no human power, and for no cause except death" (Canon 1118).

Of the Eastern Church it is said that its rule and practice on the subject of remarriage after Divorce has been altogether irreconcilable with the rule and practice of the West. But history shows that no Church in Christendom has suffered more from worldly influence from without. A Church of which an historian is constrained to say that " the Imperial Court overshadowed and overawed the Patriarchal throne. . . . The provisions of the civil law, the pleadings of present expediency . . . dimmed the clear outlines of the moral law of Christ " is not an example on which the English Church has any reason to rely.

Of the Lutheran Communions it is true that they are prepared to admit the divorced and remarried. But the reason is that the Lutheran Reformed Confessions reject the doctrine that Christian marriage cannot be dissolved. " The Lutheran Church," says Martensen, " decrees the lawfulness of an actual

divorce, and allows the innocent party to remarry." Martensen himself considers that refusal to remarry the divorced "can never be carried out in a National Church." Thus the remarriage is manifestly regarded as a concession required by relation to the State.

A Communion which in certain cases approves and authorizes divorce can consistently admit the divorced and remarried to the Sacrament. The most that such Communions can say is that Marriage ought not to be dissolved. But so long as the English Church is committed to the principle that Christian Marriage cannot be dissolved, it can find no support from the Lutheran practice. Practices permissible in a Communion which allows Divorce are no example whatever for a Communion where Divorce is absolutely forbidden.

II

Another argument for admitting the divorced and remarried to communion while the partner of their former marriage lives, is that the practice of the English Church during the last eighty years has been to show considerateness in difficult cases.

Apparently the reference is to the admission to communion of what is called the innocent party in a case of divorce for adultery. But if the innocent party has married again and in spite of that remarriage has been authorized to communicate, it is difficult to see by what authority this concession has been made seeing that it is in complete contradiction to the Canon Law of the Church of England. It is notorious that to distinguish one person as guilty and the other as innocent is by no means so simple as a previous generation appears to have thought. In any case, their having contracted another marriage is precisely what the Church forbids.

The fact is that during the past eighty years the English Church has been subject to irregularities which it would be difficult to regard as satisfactory precedents. The State has compelled the Church to lend its sanctuaries for the celebration of marriages which the law of the Church forbids. And the Church has in a good many cases practically acquiesced. It is the State which has imposed this injurious legislation on the Church. The result is that the Church has been embarrassed, acquiesced in what it is unable to approve, and its moral and religious influence has been seriously affected. In the recent discussions there has been a defeatist attitude, an air of subservience, implying that it is useless for the Church to assume an independence which it does not possess. The Church is popularly credited with a readiness for concession and for

compromise in matters where its own Establishment is involved. The difficult cases to which it is suggested that considerateness should be shewn are cases which the action of the State has imposed upon the Church. But if the Church is to fulfil its function as the Nation's spiritual leader and guide, it must exhibit firm adherence to the principles with which it is entrusted by a higher authority than the State. The irregularities of our predecessors are not a precedent for our imitation.

If this proposal to admit the divorced and remarried to communion were to be passed by the Synods of Canterbury and of York, would it apply to the English Church in England only, that is to say, only where the Civil Law of the English Nation prevailed, or would it apply also to the Foreign Missions of the English Church ?

There are Missions where converts, whose principles about marriage are widely different from those of the Church, are instructed, before they are admitted, what the law of Christian Marriage actually is, and the conditions without which they cannot be admitted. They are required to abandon the marriage principles of their former associations. They are bound—it is a condition of their acceptance—henceforward to regard marriage as the lifelong indissoluble union of one man and one woman, and to reject any contrary theories which their previous associations approved. Unless they assent to these conditions they are not admitted to the sacraments. Would these Foreign Missions of the English Church be expected to abandon their rules of what constitutes a Christian marriage, and henceforward admit to communion the cases which they have hitherto excluded ?

There is no question that to a large proportion of English people the Marriage Law of the Nation matters immeasurably more than the Marriage Law of the Church. And if English people are to see the Church admitting to its sacraments those whom its own marriage principles exclude, and making its concessions coextensive with the laws of the State, is it conceivable that public regard for the higher standard of the Church can be thereby increased ?

III

The strongest plea that can be made in behalf of the admission of such cases to Holy Communion is unquestionably the appeal to Christian sympathy. They were not aware that it was forbidden by the Church. They were driven into the course which they have taken by the misery, even the necessities, of their condition. And certainly so long as attention

is fixed on hard cases of human nature strained beyond endurance, it is unutterably piteous and deeply moving. The appeal to the heart, taken by itself, easily appears almost irresistible. Yet the heart cannot rightly decide apart from the head. There are many whom this appeal to sympathy leaves unconvinced. Not because they are destitute of charity, but because they are haunted by our Lord's uncompromising words: "Whoso marrieth her that is divorced committeth adultery." No language could be more plain. There it stands in all its sternness and severity: all the more awfully impressive because it comes from the lips of the Divine Compassion. There is something very arresting and restraining in this.

Is it safe to assume that the principles of Divorce, and the range of cases to which it may apply, as declared by the English nation in 1937, coincides exactly with the principles laid down by Jesus Christ? It is instructive to note that Dr. Inge, whose sympathies are in favour of extending the grounds of Divorce, adds the cautious reminder that "such extensions go beyond what Christ is recorded to have sanctioned." Consequently "we cannot be confident that Christ would have approved the liberties which the State allows."* If that be so, there is urgent need for the gravest deliberation lest a well-meant sympathy with the distressed should lead to sanctioning what Christ may not approve.

But the case presented in the Resolution of Convocation was not that of those who were ignorant of the law of the English Church. It was rather the case of those who "have acted in all good conscience, and are fully persuaded that under the circumstances it is right for them to live together as man and wife."

They have acted in all good conscience. Yes. But on principles that the Church cannot admit. Consider an example. They are living together as man and wife. They come to the Church to marry them. And the Church refuses. Why? Because in the eyes of the Church their former marriage still exists. Nothing can justify that refusal to marry them except the doctrine that their previous marriage cannot be dissolved. It is not in the Church's power to cancel it. If a Christian marriage cannot by its essential nature be dissolved, what else is the Church to say? In the spiritual atmosphere of the Sacred Body of Christ the laws of married life are not those of the world outside. And if the divorced are re-married by the State, and present themselves at the altar for communion, will there not be in the mind of many a priest a haunting sense of inconsistency? How can the Church declare that Christian

* *Christian Ethics*, p. 368.

Marriage cannot be dissolved, and then acknowledge as man and wife those who have dissolved it? What else must he really think but this: He whom thou now hast is not thy husband: she whom thou now hast is not thy wife. That is what the indissolubility of Christian marriage means. According to the principles of the English Church the remarriage of the divorced during the life of a former partner is sinful. The English Church instructs its members that what is required of those who come to the Lord's Supper is "to repent them truly of their former sins, steadfastly purposing to lead a new life." The invitation to communion is conditional on repentance for the past and amendment for the future.

But the distinctive nature of remarriage contracted by the divorced during the lifetime of a former husband or wife is, that those who have contracted it have involved themselves in lifelong legal obligations towards each other which they cannot evade, and are in duty bound to fulfil. The State can recognize their marriage, but the Church cannot. If I divorce my wife and marry another while she lives, and then apply for the sacraments of the Church, I am expecting the Church to recognize my second marriage, which it is conscientiously unable to do. Is this the attitude in which the Church can rightly be approached? Are there not alternatives which are mutually exclusive? Ought I not to respect and reverence the Church's law, and abide by the consequences which I have contracted? Is not a penitential state the only really appropriate condition?

The Church is not only concerned with exceptional cases, but with the indissolubility of Christian Marriage which it is entrusted to maintain, and with the effect which concessions granted to those who violate that principle will have upon the Church at large, and even on the world itself. Is it not in the deepest interests of married life, and therefore of human progress, that there should exist among men a society distinguished by inviolable adherence to the principle that Christian Marriage cannot be dissolved, and that those whose experienced incompatibility renders it impossible to remain together may separate indeed, but are not free, so long as their former partner lives, to marry again; and that those who, by their own deliberate decision, place themselves in permanent relations which it is not within the Church's power to acknowledge, ought for the sake of the Social Body of Christ to respect a standard to which they cannot attain, and to submit themselves to privations which their own manner of life has made the only really consistent line for them to adopt and for the Church to approve?

Certainly the Church most earnestly desires to welcome at its altars all who desire to receive, through the ordinary

channels, the most sacred Gift that can be obtained on earth. But if the applicants for admission are divorced and remarry while their former partner lives, the Church is not able to recognize them as man and wife. The responsibility for their action is not with the Church. There are problems beyond the Church's power to solve. But the Christian Faith assures us that God is not restricted to His own ordinances. There is always a Divine response to our petitions; and we act in accordance with fullest reliance on the Divine Goodness if we rest assured that God will supply their spiritual needs in other ways.

A STUDENT.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY

"I BELIEVE . . . in the resurrection of the body." Do most people honestly mean this when they recite these words? Would it not ease many consciences if, instead, we had to say "the resurrection of the dead"? In the offices of Baptism and the Visitation of the Sick in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, the sponsors and the sick are required to express their belief in what may seem to some an even more difficult form of the dogma, "the resurrection of the flesh." And for some centuries "the resurrection of the flesh" was the accepted formula. Thus Methodius, Bishop of Tyre, who suffered martyrdom about 312 A.D.: "So then if the soul is immortal but the body remains dead, they also who say there is a resurrection, but not of the flesh, deny in effect the resurrection of the dead."*

In the Nicene Creed, however, we find "the resurrection of the dead," largely, it is supposed, because of Origen, who protested against a materialistic view of immortality. *Carnis* (of the flesh) was retained in the Apostles' Creed, but in the English Book of Common Prayer issued in 1549 *carnis* was rendered "of the body" both in the daily offices and in the Catechism. This was probably for the sake of agreement with St. Paul's words, "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God." In the 1928 revision "of the flesh" appears only in the older forms of the Baptism service.

Probably many devout believers would, if cross-examined, say they meant "resurrection of *a* body." Yet this interpretation would hardly agree with the words of administration in the Holy Communion: "The Body" and "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." And this is in accordance with the almost universal

* Quoted by J. T. Darragh, D.D., *The Resurrection of the Flesh*, p. 138.

consensus of Christian belief down to very recent times, that the body of the resurrection will be in some real way continuous, if not identical, with the present body.

Yet it is no longer possible intelligently to hold the crude view that the actual material particles of the body laid in the grave will be restored and revitalized—what Bishop Pearson maintained, writing in 1659: "The bodies of men dissolved into dust, or scattered into ashes, shall be re-collected in themselves, and reunited to their souls." This is incredible if for no other reason than that, since man first began to be on the surface of this planet, some atoms must have formed part of several bodies in succession.

Did St. Paul think of the body that is to be raised as identical in any sense with the body of this life? John Locke, the philosopher, denied that he did, pointing to the words "that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be," "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," and also to the masculine cases in which St. Paul describes the resurrection, as implying persons, not bodies, which are of neuter gender. On the other hand, St. Paul in several passages implies a continuity of body from mortality to immortality: "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." "We ourselves, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, that is the redemption of our body." "He shall change our vile body (the body of our low estate), that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." This language suggests, not so much the substitution of a new body for the old, as the transformation of the old body into a new and better form. Agreeably to this, St. Paul, though he disparages the flesh, meaning apparently human nature as congenitally disposed to evil, exalts the body in no measured language, saying that the bodies of Christians are members of Christ and temples of the Holy Spirit and instruments for glorifying God.

"Sown," according to the most approved scholarship, signifies the introduction of the human personality into the material world at birth, not the placing of the body in the grave. As Dr. J. K. Mozley remarks in the *New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, "the natural or psychic body suggests a body animated by the principle of a merely natural life; the adjective fits better the state before death." If seeds can be said to die when they sprout, the rising to heavenly life should, on this analogy, take place individually for each soul at or soon after natural death. But that this is not St. Paul's meaning is evident from his subsequent allusion to the intermediate sleep and the celestial trumpet.

The body of the resurrection is called "spiritual," not in

the sense of immaterial, but as adapted to the spiritual life, in contrast to the natural or animate body adapted to the present natural or animate existence. In another passage (2 Cor. v. 1-4) St. Paul speaks of a "heavenly tabernacle," though whether this means the spiritual body of the resurrection or an immaterial body in which the redeemed find themselves immediately after death has been much disputed among competent exegetes. In any case this passage does not entitle us to suppose that St. Paul ever gave up his belief in a future collective resurrection, as distinct from an individual reception into Paradise or Heaven at death.

To turn to the Gospels, our Lord spoke as if He knew that after death souls retain some bodily shape and appearance. For He depicts Dives and Lazarus as mutually visible in Paradise and Hades, and as having the same bodily parts that they had on earth. We should also remark that Moses and Elijah appeared recognizably to the disciples at the Transfiguration. Again, when the disciples first see their Risen Master they think for the moment He is a ghost, an unsubstantial replica of what He was. Yet again, Jesus, according to St. Luke, bade them not to be afraid of them that kill the body, but to fear him who after he has killed has power to cast into Gehenna. (Whether He meant God or the devil is a debated point.) But in the corresponding passage in St. Matthew, He warned them against "him, who after he has killed has power to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna," as if souls have bodies in the existence immediately following death. However, in view of the apocalyptic tendency of the First Gospel, it is legitimate to prefer the Lucan version. Yet even the Matthean would not necessarily signify the total extinction of the innermost ego, but might mean only the disintegration of the personality that the ego had developed and actuated. On the whole, the Gospels are in agreement with the prevalent Jewish idea that the deceased, whether in Paradise or in Sheol, still bore some resemblance to what they had been, like Samuel when evoked by the witch of Endor, or the kings who tauntingly welcomed the king of Babylon into the underworld (Isa. xiv. 4-16).

Almost universally among the various races of the world men have believed in apparitions of their kindred and friends. And however critical we may be of the cult of spiritualism, it would be unreasonable wholly to ignore either the numerous so-called appearances of the departed that nowadays come unsought to their beloved still in the flesh, or the sifted evidence of psychical research upon the purported messages from the beyond. So far as this evidence goes, after death souls are

embodied not wholly otherwise than what they were in this world. Indeed, so similarly that from several sources—Sadhu Sundar Singh, for instance, in *Visions of the Spiritual World*—new arrivals are declared to be sometimes slow to realize their change of state.

To the body of the next life those who have become convinced of the veridicity of psychic phenomena have applied the name " etheric." We may suppose that the etheric body exists involved in the material body until dissociated by death. It resembles the material body, but is less marred by sickness, accidents, or age, or at least rapidly recovers from these disfigurements. But it may be very seriously disfigured and injured by sin, if we can trust some of these communications.

Now if it is really true that we have an etheric body which pervades the material body and becomes manifested when we leave the latter, the words of creed and liturgy referring to a resurrection and preservation of the body to eternal life begin to be intelligible. It is not the physical or material body which is to be preserved and raised, but the etheric body, or possibly some more interior immaterial organism which is latent in both, or, let us say, a body-forming principle which is attached to the soul. Some theologians—for instance, Dr. Darragh in *The Resurrection of the Flesh*, and the Rev. G. A. Ferguson in *Outlines of a Christian Philosophy*—have suggested that the soul retains a microscopic particle or atom as the nucleus of a physical body, which at the resurrection will gather to itself other material substance to form a complete body. But this seems rather a gratuitous assumption. What is necessary is that the soul should maintain an immaterial body-forming principle capable, under certain conditions, of gripping and moulding matter into a physical body that will interact with the physical world. The resurrection foretold in the New Testament and particularly in the Pauline eschatology would accordingly mean that the body-forming principle is to be so vitalized and energized that it will manifest itself in and utilize matter so as to form a body like to Christ's Body after His Resurrection. Under our present mortal conditions the bodily principle enters the physical world in the shape of an embryo, which it develops into the body of a child and then into that of an adult, and in this condition normally maintains it for some years with little alteration, and then, relaxing its hold, allows it to become feeble and finally abandons it. In the complete immortality to which we are destined—not the immortality of mere survival, and something superior even to the heavenly life which those in Christ enjoy after death—it would appear that the bodily principle will, so to say, materialize and dematerialize at the behest of the conscious

personality, having escaped from the automatic and at present inevitable process of conception, embryonic growth, birth, growth from infancy through childhood to maturity, slow enfeeblement, and physical death. The redemption of the body—that is, the change of the body of our low estate into the resemblance of our Saviour's glorious body—will be, in essence, the emancipation of the bodily principle from the temporal routine that proceeds from conception to dissolution, and its endowment with the power of clothing itself with and functioning in matter in harmony with the spiritual and eternal life of the personality.

The records of our Lord's Resurrection appearances suggest that He did not at once acquire complete materialization. Else why did He tell Mary Magdalene to forbear touching Him? But a few hours later He bade the disciples handle Him to assure themselves that His body was as solid as before, and a week afterwards we read that He invited the doubting Thomas to feel His wounds. The remark to Mary, "for I am not yet ascended," can hardly be pressed to imply that He had ascended before He met His disciples the evening of the same day, but perhaps signifies that her motive for touching Him, to obtain spiritual union with Him, could only be fully satisfied when He had attained or resumed the omnipresence proper to Deity.*

If we seek for an analogy for the function of the bodily principle, I suggest that of a plant bulb. The bulb puts forth from itself leaves and flowers, which in course of time wither and drop off, while it retains within itself the power to produce the like the succeeding spring. If the bulb could blossom continuously it would have attained an approximation to immortality. Similarly the bodily principle, having formed a physical body that has decayed and been abandoned, will have power through the redemption wrought by Christ of expressing itself in bodily form continuously, being no longer under the necessity of suffering its disintegration. This seems to have been substantially Origen's view, as expressed in the treatise against Celsus: "There is a seminal principle lodged in that which Scripture speaks of as the tabernacle of the soul." And again: "What we do assert is that just as above the grain of wheat is raised up a wheatstalk, so a certain principle lies within the body, from which, since it perishes not, the body is raised up in incorruption."† He is reported to have written a book on the subject, which has perished, and which Jerome thus sum-

* For a full discussion of the bearing of psychical research, particularly in regard to the alleged phenomena of materialization and dematerialization, on the Resurrection and other Gospel miracles I would refer to *The Psychic Powers of Christ*, by Father J. S. M. Ward, of the Orthodox Catholic Church, published in 1936.

† Contra Celsum vii. 32, v. 18.

marized in his volume against John of Jerusalem: "There exists a principle in seeds which germinates, and in which the future body is virtually contained. The trunk, the leaves, the branches, and the fruit are all implied in this *ratio* or λόγος of the seed. Similarly to this development there exists in the human body a principle which will germinate in the resurrection."*

This line of thought points to ill-health being largely due to defects in the etheric body or bodily principle. Some diseases, especially infectious maladies conveyed by bacteria, are obviously of extraneous origin. Others, such as cancer and arthritis, to which the liability increases with age, appear to arise from internal disorder. All disease may, as our Lord said with regard to the woman whom He healed of curvature of the spine, be ultimately attributable in greater or less degree to devilish agency. But both the extraneous and the internal maladies may be averted through a strong and healthy bodily principle. And this, by the way, sometimes goes along with a depraved moral character. Body and soul influence one another, as we know; but the fact that some bad people have vigorous constitutions, whereas some virtuous people are constant sufferers, tends to shew that the bodily principle, and not the soul, is the immediate determinant of bodily health and ill-health. We are thus able to connect the healing ministry of our Lord with His promise of the resurrection. When He cured the sick and raised the dead to temporary life, He was vitalizing the bodily principle in a minor degree. When He raises the redeemed to eternal life, He will vitalize the bodily principle in a supreme degree. When He made the blind to see, the deaf to hear, the lame to walk, and caused lepers to throw off their leprosy, He so vitalized the etheric body that it restored the material body to normal health and completeness. When He called back the widow's son of Nain and summoned Lazarus from the tomb, He gave such vigour to the etheric body that it recovered its lost control of the material body. When He consummates the redemption of man at the resurrection of those who live in Him, He will enable the bodily principle to express itself in the physical world in a manner conformable to the spiritual and everlasting life to which the children of God are destined.

The etheric body is affected by our treatment of the physical body. In one passage St. Paul rather mysteriously speaks of sexual irregularity as, unlike other sins, done within and against the body (1 Cor. vi. 18). Conceivably, other maltreatment of the body by unhealthy practices affects the bodily principle

* Quoted by Dr. Sparrow Simpson, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 345.

and will have distressing consequences later. Conduct does undoubtedly influence health, though not always at once. The bodily existence which we now enjoy or suffer may be to a great extent ascribable to long-forgotten behaviour in accordance with, or in contravention of, the principles of living. Righteousness in the long run makes for health, and wickedness for disease. Indeed, St. Paul endorsed the doctrine of the religion in which he had been brought up, that the most obstinate of human maladies, mortality, is the consequence of primitive disobedience. Not till we are redeemed from sin shall we be redeemed from death. Christ lived in a human body, died with it, and resumed it, in order to achieve that twofold salvation.

In some such way it seems possible to do justice and give full weight to the teaching enshrined in the New Testament concerning the importance and destiny of the body, at the same time effecting some degree of reconciliation with modern thought. The latter will not permit us to disparage the physical aspect of our existence. The Universe is so grand, the earth so beautiful, our bodies are so marvellous. The more we have of physical science, the greater waxes the wonder of the physical world. But its value is not self-contained. It exists for consciousness, for minds such as our own, and yet surpasses what we can at present apprehend or appreciate. Past evolution suggests future evolution that we may enter more fully even into our physical inheritance. But no prospect of evolution will satisfy that does not promise deliverance from the evils with which we are beset—the evils of sickness and sin and death—of which the torture is exacerbated by the fleeting visions of the glories about us. Our bodies, the organs through which we enjoy the physical world, must be cured of the ailments and disabilities that afflict them. If we are to live, not intermittently but continuously, not temporally but everlastingly, our bodies must become fit organs of our immortality. The Christian Gospel proclaims the redemption of the complete personality—spirit, soul and body—that we may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing.

F. A. M. Spencer.

THE TWO COMMANDMENTS*

I

A FEW years ago a correspondent of the *Christian World* wrote of the "worshipfulness" and "reverent atmosphere" of Anglican churches. "I am not blind," he went on to say, "to the errors and excesses of Anglo-Catholics, but the fact remains that they cultivate and encourage the devotional life."

This is a generous recognition of some of the distinctive characteristics of Anglo-Catholicism—and a just one.

For it is true of Anglo-Catholicism that it cultivates and encourages the devotional life, and it is true of Anglo-Catholic churches that they have a worshipful and reverent atmosphere, an atmosphere that seems verily charged with the presence of God. We become conscious of it the moment we enter their doors. There meets us a hush, a stillness, to which something in our own souls instinctively responds.

In Anglo-Catholic churches God comes into His own. The "first and great commandment" is given the place our Blessed Lord gave it—the first place. And their atmosphere is an unselfish atmosphere; God looms large, self looms small, in these His sanctuaries.

But in "Low," and in what are sometimes called "popular," churches this hushed, devotional atmosphere is not found. In these the human element predominates, the creature is much in evidence, the Creator but little. Reverence and devotion are weak in their services, while a suggestion of social function is strong.

In such churches the worship of God is confessedly a secondary consideration to what is known as "getting good," and the idea of God as existing for man tends to take precedence of the idea of man as existing for God.

The order in which we hold these two ideas largely determines whether our attitude towards God is, or is not, marked by

* In her youth the writer of these papers held the views expressed in the first of them from habit and under authority. Later on, prompted by a spirit of enquiry, she wandered from them and followed the path of "private judgment" into the contradictory and defective presentations of Christianity to which it leads—and beyond.

As years went on she gradually retraced her steps, and late in life found her way back to the views from which she set out, "fully persuaded" that they afford the *best* presentation of Christianity. These were (as she recollects them) the views of the less-advanced High Churchmanship of the eighteen-seventies and eighties.

There can be very few people living now who know by personal experience how strong, how thorough, how sober-minded and humble-minded that way of thinking was; how alive with God-consciousness and devotion, how simple and real in the holiness it inculcated.

reverence and humility, and it also largely determines the type of Christian character we develop. To Christians who (more or less unconsciously) think of God as existing primarily for man, to receive something becomes the first consideration in religion, and the hands so constantly outstretched in supplication are but rarely upraised in self-forgetful worship.

But Christians who think of themselves as existing for God learn to look upon it as the first consideration in religion that He should receive from them the devotion, worship and obedience that are His due.

The teaching and the worshipful services in their churches help to "lift up their hearts" to God, to thoughts of His Glory, His Divine Sovereignty, His perfect Holiness, His marvellous loving-kindness. And there is awakened within them a reverent wonder, and a "thirst for the Living God" (not for what He gives them, but for Himself), that He alone can satisfy, and a devotion to Him for His own sake that asks nothing but to express itself, and that while it does not calculate returns brings down the greatest. These, like their fellow-Christians of the other Churches, "let all their requests be made known unto God." They go to Him with all their hopes and fears, their joys and sorrows and difficulties, and look to Him to supply all their needs. This they do, but they do not leave the other undone.

A presentation of Christianity that puts God first and inspires worship and devotion gives a clearer view of the beauty of holiness, and a deeper sense of the "exceeding sinfulness of sin." The more humbly then do we examine our lives and conversations by the rule of God's commandments, and endeavour by His grace to follow after practical righteousness. The more willingly too do we submit ourselves to the spiritual direction our Church outlines for us. The Church's system of soul-training—the outcome of centuries of experience and knowledge of the human heart—can hardly fail if faithfully ministered and followed to give *thoroughness* to the Christian character, and to build up an ordered and devotional religious life.

Surely it is, as that Nonconformist writer recognizes, a more widespread desire for devotional life and for self-forgetful worship that has added thousands and even tens of thousands to the ranks of Anglo-Catholicism in recent years. And as surely it was time for a revolt against the want of reverence that is so conspicuous in connection with "God for man" religion, and which often assumes towards our Lord Jesus Christ a tone of positive familiarity. For this distressing tone of familiarity Anglo-Catholicism holds the remedy, for in every

word of its teaching and every act of its worship it recognizes in our Blessed Lord not only the human "Jesus," but the Incarnate Son of God, who was "in glory with the Father before the world was."

Anglo-Catholicism, moreover, counteracts the influence of "Modernism" and "Scientific Doubt" by "stedfast continuance in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship."

It "contends earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints," and "holds fast the form of sound words" in which from early times that Faith has been enshrined—holds them fast until the day shall come when their full content shall be revealed. For Anglo-Catholicism realizes that the human understanding is a finite understanding, and that human beings must needs walk by faith in this life, because the finite mind is not capable of grasping in their entirety the deep mysteries of God.

We may say, therefore, that the Anglo-Catholic movement in the Church of England stands for a living faith in the Incarnation, and in the Sacramental union between Christ and His Church. It stands for steadfast continuance in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, for the awakening of a spirit of reverence, worshipfulness, and devotion in church services and in human hearts, for the cultivation of practical righteousness, and of a disciplined and devotional type of Christian character.

And it stands for all these things because in teaching and practice it puts God first.

II

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." "This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."—St. Mark xii. 30; St. Matt. xxii. 37-39.

The second commandment of the Law must, of course, be given its rightful place in religion as well as the first. There must be a right relation to man as well as a right relation to God. But a right relation to man must grow out of a right relation to God if it is to be the real thing.

Neglect of duty to man seems, however, less a present-day danger than neglect of duty to God.

There is a tendency in religion today to put duty to man before duty to God, and to think that if due regard is paid to the claims of man, the claims of religion are sufficiently satisfied.

And this tendency finds its full expression in what is called "Humanitarianism" or "a religion of Humanity."

Low Church teaching (as suggested in the previous paper) tends to put "God for man" before "man for God," thus

giving man the first place. But Humanitarianism gives God no place at all. It leaves out God and duty to God, and makes the duty of man towards man the whole of religion.

Modernism within our Churches, and "oppositions of science falsely so-called" outside them, have so shaken the faith of many earnest persons that they look for something to cling to in religion which these influences cannot touch. This they think to find in Humanitarianism, and they turn to the service of Humanity as a substitute for the service of God, instead of as an outcome of it.

The charity and self-sacrifice of these persons often put us who profess and call ourselves Christians to shame. But a religion without God is as stones for bread, and only mocks Humanity's need.

That in claiming to do without God a "Religion of Humanity" offers to Him an affront of the utmost gravity is a plea that it is, of course, useless to urge upon those who have adopted a negative attitude towards Him.

Let them consider then, what has this Religion of Humanity —this "worship of Humanity" as it sometimes calls itself— to offer to the Humanity it worships? A religion that recognizes only man and duty to man, a religion with no God in it, no Christ, no Unseen and Eternal, nothing above, nothing beyond; concerned only with man's comfort and well-being here on earth, may indeed do much to promote such comfort and well-being, but that is all it can do. It leaves the spiritual side of man's nature to starve, leaves him "having no hope, and without God in the world."

What will such a religion avail him when he lies face to face with death? He will ask something more of religion then. He will ask to be assured of "the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."

Whence comes this Religion of Humanity? and what future has it before it? It comes of Christianity, of the teaching and example of Jesus Christ. Christ's Law of Benevolence the Humanitarian approves and practises, but the Christian Faith, the Faith that sees in Christ the Incarnate Son of God, and the Sacrifice for the sins of the world, he doubts, or even denies.

How long, one wonders, can such a religion survive? How long can the "service of Humanity" remain as a substitute for, instead of an outcome of, the Christian Faith?

Perhaps for a considerable time. It has the dynamic of nineteen centuries of Christianity behind it, and that is a great driving force.

A "Religion of Humanity" is to Christianity as a slip-

carriage is to the engine that has given it its impetus. It will travel on by the force of that impetus for some distance, but as the force expends itself it will gradually slow down and come at last to a standstill.

It is a serious mistake for those to whom the world has suggested doubts and difficulties to renounce the search for God and surrender themselves to philanthropy, seeking in its activities a sort of spiritual anæsthesia.

The service of Humanity is, of course, one of the paths by which we may seek God, provided such seeking is included in our intention. But there is more than one path by which those who still earnestly desire God may go in search of Him.

There are those who have wandered in the wilderness of "Doubt," who tell us that God will assuredly reclaim, that He will reveal Himself by some means or other to doubters who have really wanted Him all the time. But they must have wanted Him enough to have gone on seeking Him.

"... ye shall seek Me and find Me saith the Lord, when ye shall search for Me with all your heart."

Such is His promise. And God is often—to use a familiar expression—"better than His promise," for He will reveal Himself to those who would not dare to claim that they had wholly fulfilled the conditions attached to this one.

Like the Father in the parable He will come out to meet the seeker whose "thirst for the Living God" nothing short of Himself can satisfy.

C. B. B.

MISCELLANEA

SUNDAY WANDERINGS IN THE WEST COUNTRY

I

Illness has brought in its train an enforced absence from London, and it will be my duty to wander from Sunday to Sunday in comparative idleness. The outlook of laymen like myself tends to be too parochial, and in the belief that there is usefulness in studying the conduct of worship elsewhere, I venture to observe and chronicle as I wander.

* * * * *

The town is a seaside resort in the South, and I am staying in an outlying district which is fast becoming a rural suburb. My hostess is a churchwoman of the older fashioned sort who speaks of the old vicar as "a lovely man." On my asking her the time of the Sunday morning service at the new little church down the road, she tells me it is at half-past ten, and that it is "high." As my own choice of habit is to attend a church where the holy mysteries are celebrated solemnly each Sunday, with epistoler and gospeller and a well-ordered prayer-book ceremonial, I am naturally interested to learn what the features may be that have earned my hostess's tolerant but uncomfortable description.

* * * * *

The church is small, but well designed by a known London architect, who has used local material in a quasi-Gothic building that is pleasantly plain. The walls are gleaming white, and so far the windows are charmingly innocent of "stained glass." There is spaciousness about the simple sanctuary, as the chancel is unburdened by choir stalls, and singers sit at the back of the nave supporting a rather noisy and ill-toned reed organ with an impressive two-manual console and pedals.

The altar itself is not happily fashioned: it is naked, it is rather too short for its recess, its drab dorsal curtain sags, and its enclosing riddel curtains (though not spread open, it is true) hug the ends of the altar too closely and emphasize a note of congestion that is not relieved by an over-heavy cross and a crowding of flowers between the two candlesticks.

The parish eucharist is about to be celebrated, and the priest stands before the altar between two kneeling servers, but his habit of well-designed chasuble with apparelled amice is matched only with the jaunty brevity of a couple of cottas; and while the "introit" hymn is sung, some form of mutual confession takes place, no doubt supplementing that which is provided at a later point in the prayer-book rite.

The little church is quite reasonably filled with a wholesome-looking congregation, from which men and boys are by no means absent. Audibly and with a pleasant voice the priest begins the service, and old Merbecke, despite a maddeningly angular woodenness of gait and the ill-toned noisy harmonium, contrives to retain a vestige of solemnity. At the epistle the servers, curiously, remain kneeling, while the congregation to whom it is being addressed (though the direction of the celebrant does not suggest it) sits. Is it captious to wonder why the servers find it better to kneel?

During the hymn which precedes the gospel, one of the servers, walking with hands strangely reminiscent of the stained glass one dreads to see in the pleasant white east window, moves the gospel book, and all stand; but the bearer of the good news of the gospel firmly turns his back on his willing hearers. Such oddities of behaviour stir the inquisitive faculty, and one is tempted to ask what virtue lies in singing the epistle and gospel on a note. The solemn inflexions have their own impersonal austerity to commend them, but where is beauty, dignity, or intelligibility in the thin formality of a monotone ?

After the Creed, the priest removes his chasuble and talks simply, earnestly, and entirely convincingly to the flock, of whom he seems to be a good pastor. He talks about presenting our bodies " a living sacrifice," our whole selves; he then goes on to speak of the " beauty of worship," and there creeps into the mind the picture of the noble vesture and sweeping dignity of the pre-mediæval liturgy, set around with the majestic Gregorian tones, and one is hurt by the smaller conception—the stiff little bobs and poked-out fingers, the skinny garments and meaningless postures, the noisy grinding of a wooden chant and the poverty-struck hymn in its threadbare tune.

But worst of all, there is to be the divorce of communion from offering. The Consecration follows, the voice is dropped at the narrative of institution, the servers busy themselves with senselessly lifting the priest's chasuble while he performs the action which not only was expressly taken away in our first prayer-book but which, to quote a learned Roman Catholic dignitary, " changed the mass from a drama to a spectacle " —the elevation of the host. Then follows a multiplication of crossings and genuflexions which can hardly fail to convey to ordinary folk that the prayer-book liturgy has not done its work sufficiently. Finally the priest turns to the people and, in words borrowed from the Roman Rituale, raises the holy sacrament and bids them " Behold the Lamb of God," while three elderly communicants approach to receive the mysteries.

Can it really be that this is the culmination of the corporate act, the principal service, the catholic oblation, the characteristic activity of the Christian family ? How can " the principal service " ever be that at which the majority do not make their communion ?

Our prayer-book makes a perfectly intelligible direction that what remains of the Eucharist shall be covered with a fair linen cloth; but the celebrant here is evidently impelled to act differently, for immediately after the communion he consumes what remains and takes the ablutions at what, according to a curious standard of values, is known in sacristy circles as " the right place."

After the blessing there follows the " last gospel," to which those present seem to be accustomed, for they genuflect " at the right place." All seems to move, in fact, according to the plan of the little twopenny guides to ceremonial. It is plain that the celebrant has his eye turned towards a Church other than his own, and that, exercising a remarkable degree of private judgment, he prefers to follow the ceremonial dictates of a Church that denies his very existence as a priest. This he does possibly in ignorance of the clearly codified, simple, and intelligible ceremonial usage which rests upon entire faithfulness to the express directions of his Mother Church.

I begin to see, too, why my hostess called it " high church," and why

the older folk stay away. And I am convinced that it is not an antagonism to beauty of vesture or to dignity of movement that keeps them away, but that they have a sort of dumb instinct that there is something not squaring with the sobriety of their native rite; "there's too much playing at it."

And for myself, I shall go over to the Cathedral next Sunday, or some random village church.

PEREGRINE.

CORRESPONDENCE

CONCEPTION-CONTROL

To the Editor of THEOLOGY

REVEREND SIR,

In his article on Birth Control (in whose very first paragraph I think we find a "petitio principii") Canon Lyttelton asks: "If contraception were really a means of safeguarding in perpetuity the unity of married life . . . why this ceaseless defence of the practice?" and he adds, "No one goes about saying it is not wrong to eat."

Of course not, for no one is foolish enough to assert the opposite, though were a campaign in favour of self-starvation to be inaugurated, such a protest might become necessary!

But in the matter of birth control we are concerned with results less immediately apparent, though of not less import to the welfare of humanity, and when these, and the way of life they involve, are attacked and condemned, as in his own and another recent article in THEOLOGY, Canon Lyttelton will assuredly find "defence" forthcoming from many who believe righteousness and reason to be on their side, and who are shocked at his readiness to urge upon young married people, *who for sufficing reasons are not to increase their families*, a life of semi-separation, which is a practical denial of the validity of their union, and would go far to reduce the holy estate to the level of any ordinary relationship.

Such teaching carries no conviction to heart or conscience—perhaps because it has so little relation to present-day knowledge and needs, and so obviously regards as negligible that fulfilment of marriage of which Dr. Douglas White has said: "Not without it is the love of man and woman complete; it amplifies, deepens and interprets the spiritual unity."

That such deprivation as he enjoins may lead to profound unhappiness and disunion, Canon Lyttelton seems to realize, for he suggests the use of "separate bedrooms, or any other necessary condition favourable to the policy of abstinence," and urges that, "however severe may be the tension and perplexity between man and wife when perfect agreement" (on this point) "seems impossible," they are to invoke Divine aid (to fortify their mutual rejection of the "vow and covenant between them made," which at their marriage it was prayed they might "surely perform and keep"). Will Canon Lyttelton tell us why he considers this would be "living in obedience to the law of the Cross"?

His article bristles with assumptions of the kind, which he would be hard put to it to verify, and which Canon Barry dismisses for what they

are worth when he uncompromisingly says: " To the Christian, when it involves the weakening or impoverishment of married love, *such a course is morally wrong.*"

It will occur to Dr. Lyttelton's readers that if the use of contraceptives had all the objections and drawbacks which he enumerates, producing " incompleteness, separation and disunion," " checking and forbidding passage into the spiritual," etc., and if " instinctive repulsion persists " in those who resort to it, there could be no occasion for his fulminations, *for it would long ago have ceased* !

It is, of course, because experience disproves what he asserts, and because it *does* enable the fulfilment of true married life in circumstances where it might otherwise have to be forgone, that we recognize its value, and believe that (as the present Bishop of Victoria, Hong Kong, said five years ago, on behalf of young laymen in Newcastle) " an intelligent use of contraceptives is making much more common a relationship in marriage which is at once disciplined, without fear, and thoroughly Christian, and is leading to less, and not more, sexual intercourse outside marriage."

It is a pity that, instead of being influenced by hearsay of the vaguest kind from prejudiced sources—*e.g.*, the " evidence of French priests " (acquired presumably in the confessional, and to be received with the utmost caution, if at all)—Dr. Lyttelton does not apply to some of the distinguished clergy, doctors and magistrates who are giving support and practical help to the uphill work of eugenists and welfare workers among the poor, thus acquiring first-hand knowledge of humanity and its problems: he might conceivably retain his present convictions, but could hardly fail to acquire greater insight and understanding (and would certainly rid himself of some of the extraordinary misapprehensions so obvious in what he writes of contraceptive usage in the present day !).

If we believe, with the late Oriel Professor, C. C. J. Webb, that it is " the task of the Christian moralist in each generation to test the traditional content of the Christian moral code by the principles enunciated in the two great commandments, and to *justify or reject its details accordingly*," it cannot be right to close our eyes to developments of modern thought, and to rely entirely upon the dicta of some whose minds are still moving (or stagnant) where Mr. Gladstone's or Mr. Hutton's were more than sixty years ago. Had these excellent men survived to see new knowledge arise to meet new needs, we have no right to assume their imperviousness to it.

Dr. Lyttelton's " woeful conclusion " as to the consciences of " millions of baptized Christians (*sic*) having been defiled by a natural misinterpretation of the Lambeth resolution " is merely a rhetorical flight on his part: for even if we assume this distressing effect on those who have heard of the resolution, their number apart from community dwellers and the clergy must be relatively small.

As a clergyman's wife I am, of course, among them, and trust, if I live till 1940, to hear a yet clearer pronouncement, for only so, and as the Christian ethic is recognized as " not so much a code to be maintained as an insight to be achieved," will it commend itself to the conscience of thoughtful men and women as a sure foundation for the conduct of life and a guarantee for enduring human love.

But I must not weary you with a longer letter. I have said nothing new, but it still awaits an answer, and will probably continue so to do,

for no one who has not corresponded, as I have done, with the leading opponents of all forms of birth control (save the really injurious one which they approve) can have any idea of the paucity of reason and argument which underlies their disapproval. Statistics and eugenic considerations—health, means, conjugal happiness—appear to carry no weight with these "Catholic Traditionalists," who take their stand upon a supposed "principle" of which no definition is offered, and refuse discussion, as Dr. Lyttelton has twice done in recent years in the columns of the *Spectator*, when a correspondence initiated by himself has led him into a position impossible to defend.

I make no apology for this letter, for it is time that women should speak plainly on a matter which so vitally concerns them, and the short but trenchant letter of the Duchess of Bedford, in the *Spectator* of January 15, calling attention to one of the many points which make it unbecoming that the decisions involved should be left exclusively to the judgment of men (particularly, may I say, to that of the celibates and aged persons whom we usually find foremost in pronouncing it), must have been endorsed by every mother who read it.

I am, sir,
Yours faithfully,
M. A. Binstead.

THE BISHOPS AND MARRIAGE

Sir,

We must surely, whatever our personal convictions, be thankful that Convocation has behaved so realistically in facing the problem of admitting remarried divorcees to Holy Communion, and has manifested in its attitude the fruit of holy charity—a virtue of which we hear rather too little in these days. At the same time I am convinced that the Resolution which the Bishops hope to pass would be a grave mistake, and may try very sorely the loyalty of some moderate and, I hope, charitable Churchmen. For it would mean that, for the first time, the Church was admitting to full membership those whom her canons must condemn as living in mortal sin and leave to the mercy of God.

May I suggest another way out—more logical and practical, and, I maintain, quite as charitable? It has recently been my privilege to write for the Mothers' Union a pamphlet on Marriage and Nullity; and the more I explore the possibilities of annulment, the more convinced do I become that these possibilities are just those that best meet our modern needs. I would like to suggest that an annulment be granted to any marriage in which the full consent of both parties was lacking; and think that a case can be made out for this when (*a*) either party withholds at the time of marriage anything that is vital to marriage happiness, (*b*) when either party, at the time of marriage, was consciously or unconsciously the victim of any mental or physical disease or habit that may poison the stock, (*c*) when either or both parties have been forced into marriage for such worldly motives as material wealth or political expediency, and (*d*) when either party is, at the time of marriage, in such a state, mentally or psychologically, that he or she is not fully responsible for the action. There is no case where divorce has been desired, known to me personally, where the cause has not lain in the roots of one or other of these con-

ditions; and how can we say that such people have been properly married ? A sacrament must possess intention as well as form; and if the intention of the Marriage Service is not the complete inward consent of both parties, I would like to know what it is.

I do hope and pray that the assemblies of Convocation will do their utmost to promote the various extensions for annulment that have been made from time to time. For the theory of nullity is based upon the belief in the indissolubility of marriage; and is a great safeguard to the Christian sacrament of marriage. I think that, if the Bishops came down on the side of annulment more often, they would be able to preserve the Christian law of marriage without defiling the Christian law of charity; and that is surely an enviable state.

Ashley Sampson.

31, Harrington Gardens, S.W. 7.

REVIEWS

TIME AND ETERNITY IN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT. Bampton Lectures, 1936. By F. H. Brabant, M.A., Principal of the Mackenzie Memorial College, Zululand. Longmans. 15s.

In dealing with the perennial problem of the relation between time and eternity, Mr. Brabant has divided his Bampton Lectures into two parts. The former is primarily historical, the latter constructive. That is to say, the lecturer first of all enquires what has been made of the problem in the past; then he proceeds to examine it for himself.

The first lecture is on the conception of eternity in Greek thought, and it deals with Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus. For the Greeks eternity was the primary reality, and this world of time is only a shadow of the changeless world of forms. The forms are everlasting, unchanging, and perfect, and the divine Artificer, the Demiourgos, makes this world according to the pattern of the eternal Paradeigmata. Not that he is the Christian God, the Creator; the Greeks did not ask whence this world derived its being. Their question was with its imperfection, and the forms and the Demiourgos satisfied them, although they would not satisfy us. With Aristotle, and still more with Plotinus, there is a movement towards the Christian position, but neither of them sees the problem as the Christian does. Aristotle's God is the unmoved Mover; eternally engaged in his own self-contemplation, he only attracts the world unconsciously, ὡς ἐρώμενόν τι. And Plotinus' world is not a creature but an emanation.

The second lecture is on eternity in Christian thought, and quite rightly it begins with the Jews, for, often as it is forgotten, the fact is, as St. Paul insisted, that the Christian Church is in its origin the faithful remnant of Jewry. To the Jews the primary fact was not eternity but time; they were interested in history rather than in metaphysics; they believed in the Living God, not in an unconscious object of desire. Their God is eternal, *olam*, not in the sense that He has no connection with time, but that He outstrips it and includes it: "Thou art from everlasting to everlasting." In the Septuagint, *olam* becomes αἰώνιος, and in the New Testament this word never means a limited period of time, but vast periods stretching into the indefinite future. It is often eschatological and always

implies duration, never the *totum simul* of the philosophers. St. Augustine dealt with the question of time and eternity by denying the Plotinian view that the world is eternal and also the common idea that eternity is infinite time. Time *has a beginning*, but it *did not begin*, for there was no previous time for it to begin in. As regards "St. Augustine's conception of God's eternity, we find the Plotinian conception of an eternal present" (p. 60). "St. Augustine joins together the Greek view of God as changeless and the Hebrew view of history as purposeful" (p. 61).

In the third lecture we pass through Boethius to Aquinas, whose starting-point is the definition of the eternity of God as *totum simul*. The fact that God creates a changing world does not mean that there is change in God; "it is one thing to change one's will, quite another to will change in things." God's foreknowledge is the cause of things, but this does not abolish the freedom of the human will, because "to some things God has fitted necessary causes, but to contingent things He has fitted contingent causes"; "what is done by God's will has just that kind of necessity which He wills it to have" (pp. 69, 70). God knows particulars, not as we do by perception, but by His immediate intuition of the determinations made by His own creative power. We need not linger over the perpetuity (*ævum*) of the angels, but does Mr. Brabant really mean what he appears to when he says: "For us the angels are poetical representations of the spirit of worship"? (p. 74). Reason, says St. Thomas, cannot tell us whether the world had a beginning; we know from revelation that it had, but creation is a continuous, not an isolated act.

The fourth lecture is on time and eternity in modern thought. The pre-Kantians either explained time away or refused to take it seriously (p. 99), and for Kant it was only a category imposed on things by our own minds. Time comes into its own again with Hegel, for whom the very heart of reality is Becoming. His influence has persisted to the present day, and is seen in the thought of the three twentieth-century philosophers, Bergson, Alexander, and Whitehead, with whom the chapter ends.

The second half of the book begins with a consideration of the nature of time. There are five objections to considering the time-flux as ultimate: "It seems to leave no reality to the past; by declaring that Time is unbounded it makes it hard to suppose a rational purpose in things; it shakes our belief in ultimate values, like the True and the Good; it seems to exclude any real cause from the universe; it is not to be justified by the achievements, nor by the ideal of the moral life" (pp. 155, 156).

There is "an image of eternity in time," which reveals that "there is no impassable gulf between the two" (p. 162).

The nature of eternity and its relation to time are next considered; its essence is completeness rather than lastingness (p. 172). The Eternal is revealed in the world as Beauty, Purpose, Truth, Goodness, and Holiness. Walter Hilton is quoted as saying that God is not in things as a kernel in a nut, but "as holding and keeping them in their being through the subtlety and might of His own blessed kind" (p. 175. *Cf.* St. Thomas, *S. Th.*, I, viii, 1).

The seventh lecture is concerned with "the Problem at the Beginning of this World-Order—Creation and Predestination." "Nothing exists in the World of Becoming which is not already present more perfectly in the Eternal Being of God, but events in the World of Becoming are new in the sense that they take on the inferior form of *γένεσις καὶ φθορά*" (p. 196). This is, however, only half the problem, and we proceed to consider Predestination and Foreknowledge. There are three possible views: (1) That all things are foreknown and predestined by God (Calvin. *Query*, Barth?); (2) that all things are foreknown, but not all are predestined (Inge, Lotze, Sorley, Taylor); (3) that some things are neither foreknown nor foreordained by God (Martensen) (pp. 198 *seq.*). The lecturer wisely shows caution in giving his own opinion, but observes that "the most helpful way of conceiving this baffling problem, practically and devotionally, is the idea of God's *overruling Providence*; the evil which man does God turns to good" (p. 209).

Finally, in the eighth lecture, he deals with "the Problem at the End of this World-Order—Eternal Life." "It doth not yet appear what we shall be." Perfection, *teleiosis*, does not mean that we shall "become as God; rather it means the fulfilment of our capacities as men and as individuals" (p. 213). "Enjoyment, not pursuit, is the goal" (p. 218. Evolutionists please note). As Taylor says, there will be progress *in*, but not *to*, fruition: "The blessed, while firm in the unity of their inner perfection, may have constant enrichment *from outside*," to use a metaphor (p. 221, author's italics). The Resurrection of the Body is necessary, for we are not pure spirits, and "may we not believe that this universe . . . will be transformed to become an antechamber to God's palace?" (p. 223). (In other words, the Resurrection of the Body will be a social act.) Hell need not be considered, except to avoid it. And the lecturer concludes his task with an appeal that the consideration of time and eternity should lead us to reverence, aspiration, and the sense of mystery.

There are two appendices: one, of great impressiveness,

on "the words for 'eternal' in the Bible," the other dealing with the relation of the temporal and the eternal in the Incarnation, a problem which was omitted in the lectures for lack of time.

This is an important and very readable book and very "necessary for these times." It is, however, a pity that its price will place it beyond the reach of most readers. Fifteen shillings is more than many people are likely to give for a book of under 300 pages of large type, however good it may be.

E. L. MASCALL.

WORSHIP. By Evelyn Underhill. (The Library of Constructive Theology.) Nisbet. 10s. 6d. net.

There are two possible ways of approach for a book on Worship which is not a study of some particular rite or tradition, but treats of worship in general as the expression of man's relation to God. The first way starts from the consideration of Worship as man's activity God-wards; and this way is legitimate and right, since man is made in God's image and exists for God's glory. The other way starts from an interpretation of the "Gospel," of God's coming to man; and this way is right, since it is in Christ and in the Gospel of the Cross and the Resurrection that the true nature of man is revealed. Each of the two ways has its advantages and its limitations.

Miss Underhill's book is a superlatively good example of the former way of approach. Naturally, it would be possible to criticize isolated points here and there; but on the whole the book gives the impression of being so well done that it could hardly have been done better.* We begin with man's need for worship; we go on to see that the act of worship implies the Transcendence, the Otherness, of the Object of worship, and that Christian worship rests on the coming of God to man in Christ, and demands the truth of the Christian faith expressed in the Creed. The second part of the book deals with Jewish worship and the various traditions of Christian worship. The characterization of the many aspects of worship that come up for review shews a sympathy and delicacy of which the following remarkable passage may serve as an instance: "We ought not to be afraid to seek in the past the origin and perhaps some of the meaning of our methods of worship; still less should we be anxious to discard them, because they testify to that common

* I relegate to a footnote the collection of minor errors which it is a reviewer's invidious duty to make. Here is my list: pp. 56 *n.*, 126 *n.*, date of St. Ignatius variously given, in both cases wrongly; p. 233 *n.*, "Lietzmann" misspelt; p. 242 *n.*, *phos hilaron*; p. 248 *n.*, Dom Lambert Beauduin (so spelt) is the author of the pioneer book *La piété de l'Eglise*, but *Piété eucharistique* is by Dom. Gommaire Laporta.

humanity which we share with primitive men. It is surely mere arrogance to insist that with angels and archangels we laud and magnify the Holy Name, whilst disdaining the shaggy companions who come with us to the altar of faith: having already, indeed, discerned that altar in a darkness which we have left behind, and given costly offerings to the unknown God whom we so coldly serve" (p. 21).

The opposite way of approach might be illustrated from such a book as Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, which takes for its basis the theological *motif* of Death and Resurrection, and proceeds to shew how this *motif* determines the structure of the Church, the meaning of the Christian Ministry, and the nature of Christian worship; or from the second volume of Dr. Nygren's *Agape and Eros*, which has now been published in Swedish, and deals with the history of the Church, down to Luther. The defect of this latter method is that the claim is being made to judge various types of worship in the light of "the Gospel"; but since it is not possible that the writer's comprehension of the Gospel will be in all respects adequate, there is a danger that some of the various types of worship or teaching will be unfairly judged: whereas Miss Underhill's method, when it is in the right hands, is less in danger of twisting the judgments on the various traditions to fit a preconceived notion. On the other hand, the advantage of the latter method is that it is seeking to judge the various traditions by an objective standard, the standard which represents the Truth as it is in Christ: whereas it is difficult for the former method to escape entirely from judging the various types of worship merely by the criterion that one is more "worshipful" than another. If this criticism does not apply to any very serious extent to Miss Underhill's book, it is because her inductive study of Christian worship has brought out the main essentials of the Christian Gospel; but even so, a book which has started with an attempt to lay hold of "the Gospel" itself is thereby helped to penetrate deeper into the essential meaning of worship. Or again, to see what is really the same point from another side, Miss Underhill's study of various traditions of worship can hardly fail to suffer from a certain sameness or monotony, since all these are in various ways seeking one thing: and some readers will be thereby confirmed in the wrong assumption that no more is required for the reunion of Christendom than that the various types should recognize one another and amalgamate. What this book is prevented by its method from saying is that the schisms which in fact divide the various traditions are sinful and wrong. That can only be said by a book which starts from "the Gospel,"

and shews how the unity of the Church, which finds sacramental expression in worship, springs out of the very essence of the Gospel and of Christianity: and therefore the schisms are sinful: and therefore the way of reunion cannot be a mere coalescence of the various types of worship, but must be that those who are now separated " may agree in the truth of Thy holy word." There can be no true reunion on the basis of religion (man's way to God), but only on that of the Gospel (God's way to man, and the unity which God has made). At the same time, this book can help a great deal towards reunion by leading the various types of Christians to a more sympathetic understanding of one another's ways of worship; and it will have this effect, because it will be widely read among Christians of all sorts.

A. Gabriel Hebert, S.S.M.

NOTICES

THE PROMISE OF THE FATHER. By the Rev. R. H. Malden, Dean of Wells. Humphrey Milford. 8s. 6d. net.

In his preface the Dean tells us that this book was written with the object of making "some small contribution to the Reunion of Christendom, or, as he prefers to call it, to the Unity of the Church." He urges that the Anglican communion, with its ideal of ordered liberty, is pre-eminently fitted to help on the great task of furthering unity among Christian people. At present such help will not be, in his opinion, by way of devising schemes of Church government, but rather—as he says in a sermon with which this book closes—by an effort "to penetrate farther than we have done yet into the Mind of Christ on this matter," and by making an intensive study of the method and guidance of the Holy Spirit herein, who Himself may grant us such a Vision of Unity as has not yet appeared to the thought or to the imagination of any man. Such a study, it is suggested in the same sermon, might well be undertaken by a group of men working upon the lines of the Cambridge Platonists of an earlier period.

For this end the present book is a sort of preliminary survey, dealing as it does in detail with practically every text of Holy Scripture wherein the Person and Work of the Holy Ghost is mentioned. Thus, the author brings into the book a large number of topics of great interest, so widely separated as the meaning of "Logos," Calvin's eucharistic theology (an enlightening essay on a little-known subject), Indulgences, and "Valid Orders." Various historic forms of Church government, such as presbyterianism and congregationalism, are also passed in review. On controverted points of biblical exegesis the treatment is in general conservative —*e.g.*, the Fourth Gospel, if it be not the work of an Apostle, is at any rate that of a disciple of the Lord, who took part in the events recorded, and its later chapters rest upon a solid historical foundation. There are naturally in a work like this, dealing with so wide a subject as the work of the Spirit, many statements which will not all command an equal readiness of assent, but it is none the less a book which demands the serious attention of men of all shades of opinion in the Church.

There are two slight misprints in a note on p. 77, and on p. 105 we have the word "glossolalia" printed in Greek characters, oddly accented, but this seems to be a modern formation for which the *Oxford Dictionary* gives no authority earlier than the late Dean Farrar. A note on the Old Catholics on p. 252 lacks accuracy of statement: the ancient Church of Holland existed as a separate entity long before the Vatican Council of 1870. The account of "modernism" in the Roman Church, on p. 243, would hardly perhaps be accepted by all who have studied that remarkable movement.

W. R. V. BRADE.

TOWARDS JERUSALEM. By Amy Carmichael. S.P.C.K. 2s.

There is much that is beautiful both in poetry and devotion in this little book, which will be welcome to many in a soaring or a sorrowing mood. Those who have gone down to the depths for the souls of others will know the meaning of "No Scar?" p. 85. We quote only one verse:

> "No wound? No scar?
> Yet, as the Master shall the servant be,
> And piercéd are the feet that follow Me;
> But thine are whole: can he have followed far
> Who has no wound nor scar?"

They will echo, too, every word of the lines "Come, Lord Jesus," p. 108. The charming little poem "For our Children," p. 106, reads like a prayer from Gethsemane.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

JESUS ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN. By J. O. F. Murray. Longmans. 15s.

"In the tradition of Westcott and Hort" has become a saying with almost the sound of a degree about it. It fixes a man's attitude towards the problem of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, so that those who take up this book will know what to expect. Dr. Murray makes no apology for accepting the tradition, for to him it is the only possible one. Indeed, he throws out a challenge in his foreword, to any who doubt the correctness of the view propounded in Dr. Westcott's introduction to his commentary, to produce an argument against it as "closely knit." Until this is done the tradition of Westcott and Hort will hold the field. It is interesting to notice that, while the scholars are still debating the problems which the Fourth Gospel raises (and to say there are none is to put a man out of court in the matter), those who read the Scriptures at all turn more and more to St. John as the most profound and spiritual book in the Bible. The Christ presented to them there is more and more the Christ of experience and of their experience. St. John has taken the place of St. Paul in the hearts and minds of ordinary Christian folk. The bulk of readers are not interested, as perhaps they might be, in the questions that burn in the mind of the student. While they wait for scholars to come to a conclusion the message of St. John is sinking deeper into the thought of Christian people. In India it appears that the Fourth Gospel is one that most easily opens the way to the mystery of Christianity for the native mind. But this still leaves the questions of the scholars untouched, and if they were to decide that the great tradition of Westcott and Hort had to be given up, the message of the Gospel would still remain as a well from which the waters of life rise.

In his book Dr. Murray has given us the results of forty years' study and teaching. He gives his reasons for still holding to the tradition in which he was brought up, waiting for those who disagree to produce a work from their side as weighty as the work of those who were and are still his masters. Meanwhile the Gospel and its message remains, and all who wish to draw from this source of spiritual life will do well to buy the book, using it as their guide.

W. E. LUTYENS.

A Literary History of Religious Thought in France. Vol. III. By Henri Bremond. S.P.C.K. 16s.

In the present volume of this monumental work the learned author deals with that period of spiritual history to which the title "The French School" has come to be especially attached. It is more accurately described as "The Oratorian School"; or, as the sub-title of this volume suggests, the period of the "triumph of mysticism." Undoubtedly, in the early years of the seventeenth century, French spirituality reached its noblest and most characteristic expression.

Chronologically and historically the founder of this school was Cardinal de Bérulle, and he was followed by St. Vincent de Paul, Charles de Condren, M. Olier and Pére Eudes. Allowing for a more individualistic expression, Bossuet and Fénelon were also disciples who built their ascetic and mystical teaching upon the Bérullian foundation.

What was this foundation? In the main it was a revulsion from the current systematization of Christian devotion and a return to the earlier spirituality of the Middle Ages. It restored the pure, disinterested service of God as the true motive of Christian devotion. To quote Bérulle: "It is needful to regard God and not oneself; and not to act by this regard and desire of oneself, but by the pure regard for God." This theocentric attitude affects the whole life of prayer and devotion, which must be inspired by no desire for personal advantage, but only by entire self-abnegation for the glory of God. It was this teaching which brought the Oratorian spirituality into conflict with the Jesuit system of devotion with its emphasis on self-development "to the glory of God." Bremond appears a little apt to deprecate unduly the latter teaching in the interests of Bérulle and his school. That, in so doing, he is aiming at definition rather than criticism is made clear in an appendix to the book.

This is the chief criticism to be made of a book which attempts—and succeeds in giving—a detailed summary of the spiritual teaching of so many of the great French masters. The book is expository rather than critical, it abounds in quotations from original sources, and is fully documented in its footnotes.

The old maxim of the prophet in his own country is illustrated by the reception given to these great French spiritual leaders by the contemporary theologians of their own nation. M. Bremond examines this phenomenon in an exceedingly valuable appendix, and suggests as an explanation that the theologians have been too prone to erect a barrier between their science and their interior life. Bérulle, Condren, Olier, and others of this school broke down the barrier by their unexpected mixture of dogmatic speculation and devotion, and so incurred the suspicions of the systematic theologians. Yet it is safe to say, in a long view, that the work of the spiritual leaders had a more profound and enduring quality.

H. L. Hubbard.

An Apostle of Reality. The Life and Thought of Rev. William Porcher Du Bose. By Theodore Du Bose Bratton, Bishop of Mississippi. Longmans. 9s.

Theological students who were in training during the closing years of the nineteenth and the opening decade of the twentieth centuries will remember the series of books which were then coming from a new

writer in America, Dr. Du Bose. *The Gospel in the Gospels* was perhaps the most striking. But all Dr. Du Bose's books were taken seriously, for it was recognized that here was a man who, in a Church without ancient traditions and in a somewhat isolated position, had thought out theological problems for himself on lines similar to those of representative English churchmen like Westcott. Against the doctrine of Evangelicalism, which made the Atonement the central fact of Christianity, this type of thought laid stress on the Incarnation; and the Atonement took its place as the effect of the Incarnation, proceeding not from the wrath but from the love of God, and aiming at not merely the forgiveness but the perfect holiness of man. The work now under review is a tribute of affection from one of Du Bose's kinsmen, Dr. Bratton, Bishop of Mississippi. It begins with a sketch of Du Bose's life, and ends with a description of each of his works. The life itself is arresting enough. Du Bose was a combatant in the American Civil War, and narrowly escaped death more than once. By the efforts of friends who were convinced that he had important spiritual work to do he was changed from combatant to Chaplain. After the war he was appointed as Chaplain and Professor of Moral Science at the University of Sewanee. Here his main life-work was accomplished. Du Bose possessed a mind at once devout and critical, and in the religious atmosphere of the Southern States, which had not hitherto been greatly affected by the advance of knowledge, he was able to be of assistance to many young men entering the ministry. There was formed between him and them that bond which is one of the most precious gifts life can bestow, the friendship between an honoured teacher and grateful pupils. "If they felt," he said at the end, "that in their four years with me I had been something to them, I felt that in my forty years with them they had been everything to me."

The world moves so quickly that the thought of one century, sometimes even of one generation, is apt to appear out of date when viewed from the next. Du Bose was clearly in the orthodox theological tradition. He was far removed from the depreciation of reason characteristic of Barthianism. But he was awake to difficulties widely felt today. The Incarnation, he said, was "an Incarnation not of the physical properties but of the moral, spiritual, and strictly personal qualities of God." Dr. J. O. F. Murray, who visited America in 1922 to lecture on "Du Bose as a Prophet of Unity," enters a caution against making distinctions of kind between the various divine qualities. It is undeniable, however, that the humanity of Christ has often been obscured in popular thought, if not in strict theology, and some way must be found of countering the notion that Christ was, in His human life, an omniscient wonder-worker. So, in dealing with the question of miracles, Du Bose rejected the idea that the supernatural could only be revealed by a displacement of the natural. The true supernatural, he taught, is the higher natural. Perhaps it would be better to say that the supernatural is the deeper natural, evident to those who have eyes to see it, and not to those who seek after a sign from heaven. But after all, Du Bose is chiefly noteworthy for a pure and devoted life; and there are few who read Bishop Bratton's testimony who will not be touched by it, and share his reverence for an outstanding Christian character.

G. W. Butterworth.

THE ROYAL GATE. By Flora Abigail MacLeod. S.P.C.K. 3s. net.

THE FATHER AND HIS SONS. By Bishop A. B. L. Karney. S.P.G. and S.P.C.K. 1s. net.

AMONG THE MYSTICS. By the Rev. W. Fairweather. T. and T. Clark. 5s. net.

Among the many recently published books dealing with the spiritual life these three call for special comment.

Miss Macleod has written a handbook for beginners in the art and science of prayer. She has attempted, with no small degree of success, to bridge the gulf which stretches between the beginnings of the prayer-life and the far horizons of mature experience. There is abundant need of such bridges. Many souls make no attempt to move forward in the interior life of personal communion with God, and others are discouraged by the technicalities from which so many writers cannot disentangle themselves. Miss MacLeod has both the requisite knowledge and experience, and also a real gift for expressing herself in simple language.

Of recent years the S.P.G. has published a book, with a missionary flavour, for Lent reading. The Bishop of Southampton has written an admirable little treatise on the parable of the Prodigal Son, and his book should supply many subjects for prayer and meditation.

Dr. Fairweather has essayed the task of writing a history of Christian mysticism, and, up to a point, he has succeeded in this very difficult undertaking. There are, however, some rather serious omissions—*e.g.*, there is no mention of Richard Rolle, Augustin Baker, and Gertrude More among the English mystics, nor St. Gertrude and the Victorines amongst the Germans and the French. He shews a further lack of discrimination in assigning to the Quietists an equal place with the Catholic mystics. Despite these faults his book gives a valuable historical picture of the Christian mystics; and this part of the book is certainly better than that which deals with the basic principles and main features of Christian mysticism. Here the author is content with the typical Protestant standpoint with its main emphasis on personal religious experience.

H. L. HUBBARD.

WE BEHELD HIS GLORY. By Nicholas Arseniev. S.P.C.K. 5s. net.

The author of this little book presents us with something new in the literature of the Christian Reunion movement. He gives it as his profound conviction that only in the light of the overwhelming victory of the Resurrection can there be achieved a union of all who believe in the Lord Jesus. Herein lies the true Christian realism, and herefrom springs the inspiration and the power to weld all Christian believers into a visible fellowship in Christ. In the light of this conviction the author surveys the trend of contemporary Christianity, devoting the major portion of his space to a study of post-war religion in Germany.

There is an admirable chapter on the "incarnation-theology" of modern Anglicanism, which the author rather aptly describes as a combination of the Johannine faith with much emphasis on the social side of the Christian message. His penetrating analysis of the consequences of this "incarnation-theology" in the sacramental emphasis of modern Anglican theology and devotion is an exceedingly valuable piece of work.

H. L. HUBBARD.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY: THE EMPIRE'S CROWN. By Jocelyn Perkins, M.A., D.C.L., F.S.A. Duckworth. 7s. 6d.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY THEN AND NOW. By Arthur E. Henderson, F.S.A., R.B.A., F.R.I.B.A. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Two well-contrasted books on a well-loved church. The Sacrist of the Abbey has condensed thirty-eight years of devotion and study into 319 pages, and could easily have filled twice that number. He must have read everything that has been written, summarizes it in a readable and handy form, and has added much that is his own.

His book is full of quotations, but he has no room for references or even a bibliography. He has, however, plenty of room for superlatives, and though he is critical at times he is more generous of praise than blame. He has hard things to say of some of the monuments which disfigure the building, but is tolerant on the whole. When he is writing about the treasures of the Abbey he is at his best, but it ought to be put on record that it is to his zeal and enthusiasm that we owe so many of the gifts which enrich the church today.

Mr. Henderson's little book helps us to judge the beauties of the buildings, "then and now," for ourselves. He only allows himself 40 pages, of which 20 are full-page illustrations and 12 of these reconstructions. "Reticence," he says, "bespeaks the expert craftsman," and reticence is the key-note of his work.

He gives photographs of the existing church and reproductions of the two old ones. Five deal with the Norman church, three with the work of Henry III, and a double-page drawing gives "The Abbey of St. Peter and Palace of Westminster about the year 1537." This, the most valuable bit of reconstruction ever done, makes us long for a larger edition of the book.

It seems amazing that anyone could have pulled down the Confessor's church even in favour of "the beautiful French thought expressed in terms of perfect English" (Perkins, p. 38). The structure may have been old before its time (Papal bull, July 26, 1245), but this is only one of the many interesting points which the books suggest. There is no room to discuss central and western towers, missing statues or the completion of the Confessor's shrine. Mr. Henderson must plead for himself. "Why should we always be reminded of unpleasant history?"

Each author has made a valuable contribution to the literature of the Abbey. Each book is well worth the money, and in each there is something to interest every lover of "The Empire's Crown," at home or overseas.

LEIGH H. NIXON.

A HISTORY OF THE EARLY CHURCH TO A.D. 500. By J. W. C. Wand, D.D., Archbishop of Brisbane, formerly Dean of Oriel College, Oxford. Methuen. 8s. 6d.

Dr. Wand has done good service by completing Messrs. Methuen's trilogy of Church History text books, intended chiefly for G.O.E. students.

In the past such books have been liable to faults common in all historical primers and to peculiar faults of their own. They have tended to give a personal and piecemeal account instead of the wider social conspectus. They have also tended towards an ecclesiastical jargon

and a too explicit drawing of morals. The present work is mostly free from these failings. Details and general summaries are well balanced, and it is written in a clear, straightforward style which will be gratefully recognized by those who heard the author's Oxford lectures.

One criticism of method may, however, be made, though not dogmatically. This book usually sacrifices to chronology the continuous development of different subjects. Thus, for instance, Gnosticism is separated from its Judaistic forerunners and its Montanist reaction. There is certainly a danger of over-simplification, but it does seem that the heresies and schisms of the second century should be treated as an integrated and continuous subject. Only so can the elementary student escape from a meaningless jungle of sect names and philosophical terms and begin to understand the underlying difficulties of thought in that distractedly eclectic age.

Again in the history of persecutions there seem to be too many breaks. In consequence we miss the general sweep of the imperial fortunes from the Antonine prosperity through the chaos of the "barrack-room" Emperors up to the authoritarian and die-hard pagan revival of Diocletian's reign. Nowhere in Church history is it more important to display in clear and continuous development the background of the secular world.

The relation in time of different movements can be preserved by separate short accounts of periods with their general characteristics, and in the present case good chronological tables help to serve the same purpose.

Finally, we would especially praise the compact chapter on Church Life and Worship, the detailed comparison of the Alexandrian and Antiochene attitudes (often only referred to in textbooks), and also the last chapter but one on the Outskirts of Empire, giving Armenia, Persia and Britain their due place in the post-Nicene picture.

This is undoubtedly a book to recommend both to students and to any general reader who is wise enough to desire a knowledge of the origins of the Christian Church.

E. W. Edmonds.

Calvin and the Reformation. By James Mackinnon, D.D. Longmans. 15s.

The most important section of Professor Mackinnon's book is the chapter on Calvin as a theologian. The exposition given of his doctrinal system is admirably clear, but interspersed with critical comments of the expositor. Thus "Calvin had evidently not read the story in Genesis objectively . . . nor had he read it critically." The accuracy of the criticism need not be questioned, but it would have been more satisfactory to separate the exposition from the estimate of its value regarded from the standpoint of a writer of today. The criticisms are historically important as illustrations of the distance which parts the Reformer of the sixteenth century from the Reformed of the twentieth. Yet it would be more critical to let the Reformer have his own say first and that reflection on the permanent value of his teaching should follow after. Indeed, the author has adopted this plan in his treatment of Calvin's judgment on Servetus. The facts are recorded first and the criticisms come later.

The general standpoint of the book is that of an independent observer, not by any means of a disciple, as the following extracts will shew. "It will not do to say, as his panegyrists do, that he was actuated in all things by the Grace of God, to assume the absence of the human strain in his motives and his actions" (p. 282). "He must be judged by an even stricter standard than his fellow-inquisitors of the Roman Church who appealed to the Canon law and ecclesiatical tradition in defence of their right to persecute, and whom he denounced as ignorant of the truth" (p. 283). "If John Calvin were to be born anew in the early twentieth century he would have difficulty in recognizing himself in large numbers of his spiritual descendants who nevertheless honour him as their spiritual ancestor."

The whole work is eminently readable.

W. J. Sparrow-Simpson.

Three Views of the Church: The Parables of the Gospels. By Hugh Martin. Student Christian Movement. 5s.

It would probably be true to say that since attacks upon the miracles in the Gospels have gone out of fashion, the parables have come into their own; and the books which have recently appeared on that subject are likely to prove the first few drops of an ocean that is about to overwhelm us. Mr. Hugh Martin's book is scholarly so far as it goes; but he touches too lightly upon the fringe of big movements that are only too likely to change our outlook upon the parables as they must, to some extent, upon the whole Gospel. In any case his method of splitting up the parables into self-contained units is likely to be misleading to the very audience that his book and its publishers would seem to be addressing.

The best thing about Mr. Martin's book is the manner in which it goes straight to the heart of the world upon which the parables of Jesus broke in their beautiful colouring. Such parables as the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son possess a universal appeal for all ages; but the Sower, the Hidden Treasure and the Talents gain immeasurable importance from a knowledge of the world that first heard them. It is, however, the purpose that our Lord had in dealing in parables, and the manner in which He anticipated their acceptance, that matters most; and upon such problems as these Mr. Hugh Martin's book is not so good a guide as one could wish.

Ashley Sampson.

The Gifts of the Holy Ghost. By Frank Hudson Hallock, S.T.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This book is not a study of what are technically called the charismata, but is an exposition by an American theologian of the sevenfold gifts bestowed in Confirmation. But it is much more than a book of Confirmation instructions. The first three chapters are almost a compendium of the theology of the Holy Spirit, with special reference to His work in the present-day world through the Church, the priesthood, personal religion. Under each of these heads Dr. Hallock has many stimulating things to say before he goes on to detailed consideration of each separate gift. The gifts are supernatural, expressed through the corporate life

of the Catholic Church and shared in by her individual members. Wisdom, *e.g.*, is the practical gift which enables us to apply the truths which the gift of understanding has led us to perceive; it is acquired not by study but by gift in answer to prayer. It is also *the* gift which perhaps more than any other makes the Church indestructible. Among other things, it enables her and her members to distinguish between true and spurious mysticism. But all the gifts must be relied upon and must be used. It is to the substitution of worldly wisdom for dependence on and use of this supernatural gift that Dr. Hallock traces many of the signs of weakness in the Church today. The copious extracts from the writings of theological teachers, from the early Fathers and St. Thomas to Thornton or Solovyof, and an excellent bibliography, add to the worth of a valuable book.

J. R. Pridie.

The Divine Christ. By A. E. Baker. The Centenary Press. 8s. 6d.

The worth of this fine book depends mainly on the reader for whom it is meant, and it is plainly meant for the reader whose faith has been shaken by modern thought. Such a reader wishes to believe, but how can he believe? Well, Mr. Baker bears his peculiar needs carefully in mind, and presents his point of view with skill and with sympathy, and the sympathy is at least as evident as the skill. The author examines the claims of theism, of religious experience, of revelation and of miracles in the light of the mind of our generation, and he never makes the least attempt to put his claims and arguments too high. He leaves us with the impression that in instance after instance he might have pressed his points with greater and graver emphasis. At the same time he is wise in trying this method of approach, for the reader he has before him will realize how much stronger the arguments might have been put. In fact, Mr. Baker aims at under-statement rather than at over-statement, and we are convinced he is right in his aim. Last of all, the life and teaching of our Lord appears as the climax of the book, and all the lines of argument converge upon Him.

R. H. Murray.

Kant's Metaphysic of Experience. By H. J. Paton. Allen and Unwin. 2 vols. 30s. the set.

Every student of philosophy will welcome this authoritative commentary on the first half of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. The object of these two volumes is to make the Kantian Metaphysic intelligible to the ordinary reader of the *Critique*. By his thorough study of Kant's writings, and by his wonderful gift of lucid and interesting exposition, Dr. Paton has been completely successful in the very difficult task that he set for himself. This work interprets Kant to the English reader as no other work on Kant has done. Edward Caird, for instance, produced a classic on the philosophy of Kant, but while he makes admirably clear in his great work what is his own teaching he often fails to make clear what is the teaching of Kant. Kant has often suffered at the hands of his admirers and has sometimes been made needlessly obscure as a result of the labours of his commentators. At last, however, we have a great philosopher devoting himself exclusively to the elucidation of what Kant himself has written. There are some minor points in the *Critique* which Dr. Paton

frankly admits he does not understand, and there are some sentences which so baffle him that he cannot translate them. But these obscurities are few and for the most part insignificant. The difficulties which have perplexed other scholars and are completely removed by Dr. Paton's faithful rendering of the thought of Kant are, on the other hand, numerous and vital to the interpretation of Kant's Metaphysic. To take the simplest example, the exact point of Kant's comparison between his own innovation in philosophy and the Copernican innovation in astronomy is for the first time exposed. The illustration is an illustration and not, as everybody has assumed, an obscuration.

Dr. Paton is convinced that Kant's Metaphysic is a consistent whole, and a painstaking and appreciative study of the *Critique* in the light of this conviction has led to the resolving of many apparent inconsistencies. It is safe to say that Dr. Paton understands Kant as few scholars can claim to do, and no student of philosophy can fail to understand Dr. Paton's explanation of Kant. After travelling the long road with Dr. Paton as guide the student will probably agree with what Dr. Paton says at the end, that not only has the journey been well worth while, but also that the goal reached is nearer to the truth than most of the short cuts attempted by more recent philosophers are able to reach.

That this will become the authoritative book on Kant almost goes without saying. But of such a book this needs saying and saying emphatically, for it is unusual:—whatever subject is turned up, from *a priori* synthetic judgments to transcendental schemata, the reading is found to be both unambiguously intelligible and enthrallingly interesting. To say that of a work on Kant is saying a great deal.

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

SAINTS OF ENGLAND. By L. Sherley-Price. Church Literature Association. 3s. 6d.

Three-fourths of the 60 saints here described in short readings are pre-Conquest. Anglo-Saxon England is so far away that a brief chronicle, in which the background cannot be sketched in, is inevitably rather dry. Take S. Walburga as an example. "Walburga, daughter of Richard, King of Wessex, and sister of Willibald and Wunibald the missionaries, was brought up at Wimborne, and at an early age found a vocation to the Religious Life. When S. Boniface went on his mission to Germany, he took with him Walburga, Lioba, and other nuns, hoping with their assistance to establish convents in the country which would be strongholds of Christianity in a heathen land. Walburga, capable and holy, became Abbess of a Convent founded by her brother Willibald at Heidenheim. . . ." Is it frivolous to compare the Mouse in *Alice in Wonderland*, trying to dry the animals with "the driest thing I know"? "William the Conqueror, whose cause was favoured by the pope, was soon submitted to by the English, who wanted leaders, and had been of late much accustomed to usurpation and conquest. Edwin and Morcar, the earls of Mercia and Northumbria . . ."

Father Sherley-Price has made a valiant effort to provide a much needed book, but the problem is really insoluble. Each reading ends in a prayer. That for S. Walburga begins: "O God, who among the numberless gifts of thy grace dost also work thy wonders in the weaker sex . . ."

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE TEACHING OF THE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH. Faith Press. 3s., 2s.

This little work is a translation of a questionnaire drawn up by Miss Payne Smith and submitted to a number of theologians of his Church by Tafari Makonnen in 1922. It has been hidden for twelve years and is now translated by Rev. A. F. Matthew, recently Anglican Chaplain at Addis Ababa. The book is the first attempt to give us in English the teaching of the Ethiopian Church. The document has one serious disadvantage in that the Amharic translation of many of the English questions is faulty; the term sacrament is always understood to refer to the Eucharist, so that the answers on Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, Matrimony, and Unction are misleading. There is no reference to monophysitism. Question 2 states that the Church has received and teaches the faith of Nicæa. There is no trace of anything like Judaism, with which the Abyssinians are credited by Fortescue. The book has a useful introduction by Canon Douglas.

F. N. HEAZELL.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher

The Parish Communion

A Book of Essays

Edited by A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

CONTENTS :

THE PARISH COMMUNION IN ITS SPIRITUAL ASPECT.
A. G. Hebert, M.A.
MAN, MANKIND AND GOD.
D. R. Blackman.
THE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW COVENANT.
J. O. Cobham, M.A.
EUCHARIST AND CHURCH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.
Austin Farrer, M.A.
THE IDEA OF "THE CHURCH" IN THE PRIMITIVE LITURGIES.
Gregory Dix, B.A.
LITURGY AND PERSONAL DEVOTION.
C. P. Hankey, M.A.
IDEALS FOR THE PARISH.
J. F. L. Southam, M.A.
THE HALLOWING OF DAILY LIFE AND WORK.
E. Denis Tyndall, M.A.
THE PRIEST HIMSELF.
J. F. Briscoe, M.A,
THE LITURGICAL SERMON.
M. R. Newbolt, M.A.
INSTRUCTION IN WORSHIP.
H. de Candole, M.A.
FROM A COUNTRY VILLAGE.
F. R. Fairbairn, A.K.C.
FROM A TOWN PARISH.
W. S. Baker, M.A.
THE CHURCH IN THE WORLD.
Charles Smyth, M.A.

This book grows out of the dissatisfaction felt by many Churchmen with the prevalent custom of making one's Communion at an early service and worshipping at a later service. The idea of the Holy Communion as the Corporate Offering of the Church needs to be re-thought in the light of its doctrinal and practical implications. This the writers have tried to do with the fullness demanded by the importance of the revolution they are trying to introduce.

7s. 6d.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2

And of all Booksellers